

The Classical Review

JULY 1906.

'MELANDRA CASTLE.'¹

THE appearance of the handsome and profusely illustrated volume of 183 pages thus entitled should be a great and welcome encouragement to those who believe that for classical studies in this country there is a future as well as a past. It has a claim to special notice as it embodies the first fruits of the policy of local development upon which the Classical Association embarked at the end of 1904. It forms in fact the first report of the Manchester and District Branch of the Association and is edited by the Professor of Latin at the University of Manchester, to whose energy and enthusiasm the foundation of the branch is in chief measure due.

The major part of the volume is devoted to the excavations of the Roman site from which it has taken its name, but includes much other matter, as the following account will show.

First comes a 'note' by the Editor who is also chairman of the Committee of the Branch and of the Excavation Committee, the opening sentences of which we quote to show the spirit in which the work has been approached.

'If the aim of the Classical Association may be defined in a sentence, it is to preserve and proclaim the connexion of Classical studies with the larger and deeper interests of daily life. The

history, the politics, the society, the literature, the religion of our own community, all have their roots in antiquity; and none of these can be fully understood without the help of the great ancient writers whom the Classical student learns to count among his wisest and most delightful friends. His work is to build a bridge between the life of the past and the life of the present; his ambition is to make the bridge a broad, well-trodden road. One of the means to this end is to discover and interpret the actual traces which remain in our own district of the power which the Romans held in Britain throughout the first four Christian centuries.'

Amongst those to whom obligations are recorded are—Mr. R. Hamnett 'to whose skill and enthusiasm is due the rescue of the site, the preservation of the remains and the whole possibility of any systematic study of the fort,' Mr. J. Swarbrick, A.R.I.B.A., for surveying the site, Mr. Francis Jones, M.Sc., for analysing various substances found in the camp, and Mr. F. W. Parrott for producing the photographs contained in the volume. Also to Professor W. Ridgeway and Dr. F. Haverfield for valuable advice on many important points. Canon E. L. Hicks, the President of the Branch, contributes a short introduction on the intellectual stimulus and educative value of such researches. The exploration of a small Roman fort can, he points out, 'be made a precious object lesson of Classical method.' Next follow papers on 'the Ancient Roads

¹ *Melandra Castle*, being the Report of the Manchester and District Branch of the Classical Association for 1905. Sherratt and Hughes, Publishers to the Victoria University of Manchester. Price 5s. net.

connected with Melandra and the Site' by Professor Boyd Dawkins, 'the Roman Occupation of Derbyshire' by Dr. Haverfield, 'the Roman Place-names of Derbyshire' by Mr. W. B. Anderson, 'the Excavations at Melandra in 1905' by Mr. F. A. Bruton (the Hon. Secretary of the Excavation Committee) and on 'Some Features of of Roman Forts in Britain' by the same and on 'the Pottery found at Melandra' by Mr. J. H. Hopkinson. After these come two short papers by the Editor on 'the Roman Coins found at Melandra' and on 'the Trade- and Coin-Weights found at Melandra' and a 'List of Miscellaneous Remains in the Custody of Mr. Hamnett' by Professor Boyd Dawkins and the Editor, and last, three papers of a historical or literary character 'Legio XX. Valeria Victrix,' (a detachment from which was at one time quartered at Melandra) by Mr. Harold Williamson and 'the Probable Date of the Roman Occupation of Melandra' by the same and 'Britain in the Roman Poets' by Miss Dora Limebeer.

There is added, as in such publications there always should be, a full index, which has been compiled by Mr. W. J. Goodrich. Two appendices containing the Proceedings of the Branch and a list of its Members complete the volume.

The book is accompanied by a large map of the excavations on the scale of thirty feet to the inch, and is illustrated by numerous photographs, engravings in the text and plans. The frontispiece shows the Roman

roads connected with Melandra and a 'pre-historic Ridgeway crossing Werneth Low.' We would gladly devote more space to a description of contents and illustrations; but we purposely refrain in the hope that all of our readers who are interested in this side of classical research will encourage the committee in their laudable efforts by purchasing the volume for themselves. Funds are greatly needed to continue the work at Melandra and to excavate new sites. In Germany, where the public support of natural, historical and linguistic science is intelligent, organised, and methodical, there is no especial need for drawing upon private beneficence. In America the public-spirited millionaire is found to take upon himself some part at any rate of the debt which riches owe to research. But in this country the shortcomings of the national administration are but too rarely compensated by the enlightened liberality of the opulent. Let the magnates of commerce at Manchester, which Canon Hicks tells us 'has never been wholly given to the idolatry of wealth,' be stirred at least by the Committee's appeal to their local patriotism, and determine that the new investigations at Toot Hill and Castle-shaw which the Committee propose, shall not languish for lack of funds. They need have no doubt as to the value of these inquiries sanctioned as they have been by liberal grants from the University of Manchester and the British Association for the Advancement of Science.

VARIA GRAECA.

I.—*A Lacuna in the Iliad.*

The Homeric text has at all periods of its existence been so jealously guarded by grammarians, editors, and readers, that, when the patina of phonetic change is scraped off, emendation in the ordinary sense has little to do. For one passage however the mere sense is difficult.

T 76 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν

Ἀγαμέμνων

αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης οὐδ' ἐν μέσσοισιν ἀναστὰς·
ὦ φίλοι ἥρωες Δαναοί, θεράποντες Ἄργος,
ἑσταότος μὲν καλὸν ἀκούειν, οὐδὲ ἔοικεν
ὑββάλλειν· χαλεπὸν γὰρ ἐπισταμένῳ περ εἶναι.
ἀνδρῶν δ' ἐν πολλῷ ὁμάδῳ πῶς κέν τις ἀκούσῃ
ἢ εἴποι; βλάβεται δὲ λιγύς περ ἐὼν ἀγορητής.

Agamemnon who was wounded in A speaks from his chair without standing up. He seems to apologise for doing so and asks for allowance to be made him. How does this come out in vv. 79, 80? 'It is right to hear a man upon his legs, and it is improper to interrupt'; but Ag. was not upon his legs: the usual speaker was and, as this was the proper posture, had no special ground to deprecate interruption. Agamemnon cannot stand, and as it is difficult to make oneself heard sitting, therefore he begs for silence. A line is wanted to contain these ideas, e.g.
ἦσθαι· ἀλλ' ἔμπης μευ ἀκούμεν, οὐδὲ ἔοικεν
ὑββάλλειν.

'A speaker ought to stand, not to sit:

still listen to me without interrupting, for it is difficult even for a good orator to make himself heard.' This omission, which must have been very ancient, caused Zenodotus to leave out 77, on the ground that the allusion ἐξ ἔδρης is not taken up again. Alexander of Cotiaeum improved the story. The scholiast however on 77 had the right interpretation, whatever he read: δ δὲ Ἀγαμέμνων οὐκ ὀρθῶς δημηγορεῖ διὰ τὴν τοῦ τραυμάτος ἀλγηδὸνα· διὸ ἐπιφέρει ἐποσιμώμενος καλὸν μὲν εἶναι ἐστῶτα δημηγορεῖν, ὡς δηλονότι καθήμενος.

Homer's ear was not sensitive to assonances in consecutive lines: I can produce no example of οὐδὲ ἔοικεν nearer than three lines apart (Φ 319, 322); but cf. in the *Iliad* ἀμφενέμοντο, ἐνέμοντο B 634, 5; ἔποντο, ἐνέμοντο *ib.* 737, 8; ἔκοντο, τράποντο Γ 421, 2; πονέεσθαι *bis* K 116, 7; τοῦ ἐνόησεν, τε νοήσῃ *ib.* 224, 5; αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλοι N 799, 800; καὶ Μενέλαον, καὶ Μενέλαε P 507, 8; Καλλιάνασσα, Ἰάνασσα Σ 46, 7; Αἰακίδαο *bis* *ib.* 221, 2; -ον ἔδωκαν, -ον ἔδωκεν Ψ 745, 6. On the other hand homoeoteleuton has its maximum of effect in hexameter verse. I have collected the cases where assonance has led to omission in the Hymns *J.H.S.* 1895, pp. 272 sq. Such an elaborate repetition as that in the line I have invented may account for so early an omission.

II.—*νοῦθος*, a footfall.

The word *νοῦθος* 'footfall' is ignored by the Lexica. Herodian π. μον. λεξ. 42 after enumerating στρονθός, Ξοῦθος, βοῦθος says *νοῦθος* κύριον ψόφος ἐν οὔδει· Ἡσιόδοος ἐν τρίτῳ (sc. Καταλόγῳ) *νοῦθος* δὲ ποδῶν ὑπόδουπος (ὑποδοῦπος cod.) ὀρώρει, fr. 48 Rzach. After κύριον we must perhaps add a καί. Neither Lehrs nor Rzach understands ἐν οὔδει; the former even printed ἦν οἶδε, and there are other attempts. Ἐν οὔδει defines the species of ψόφος which *νοῦθος* denotes: h. Herm. 149, when Hermes returned to his cave

οὐ γὰρ κτύπεν ὥσπερ ἐπ' οὔδει (Tibullus i. 8. 66 illius credo tunc sonuisse pedes).

I hope this parallel may induce Herr Rzach to remove his †, as it should give the coup de grâce to Fick's ἐπ' ὧδῃ in the Hymn, to which Mr. Sikes and I were too kind.

III.—On the plural of γῆ.

Why is γῆ 'rare in the plural,' as the Lexica say? Homer has γαῖάνων, but in

the Attic period the singular is the predominant partner. Ionic prose knew the plural (γεῶν Herod. iv. 198, γέας πλείστας εἶδον Democritus in Clem. Alex. I. § 69), and in Aeschylus fr. 198 (*Prom. λυόμενος*) quoted by Steph. Byz. in Ἀβιοί, the MSS. of Stephanus give

αὐτόσποροι
γέαι φέρουσι βίοντον ἄφθονον βροτοῖς

and γάιαι which all the editors of Aeschylus have accepted is due to one of the editions of the Ἑθνικά. The dual is introduced, with a confidence which I do not altogether share, into Aesch. *Persae* 737

ἄσμενον μολεῖν γέφυραν γαῖν δυοῖν ζευκτηρίαν for ἐν of the MSS. The alternative is Blomfield's ταῖν, where the ellipse seems doubtful. Later writers have no objection to the plural (Aristotle γαῖ, Strabo γᾶς, Crinagoras Anth. Pal. ix. 430. 1 γέαι), nor have inscriptions (Collitz 60 B 20 ζας τασδε και τους κρηπος, Hoffmann *Ionic* 80 C 10 τας γεας, 139 p. 64, v. 40 δημοσiai γεαι, 140 p. 65 τας γεας των φυγαδων, 173, p. 75 γεας και οικιας).¹ The case is parallel to that of ἔλη, which is passed over in our Lexica, and briefly treated by Zachariae in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* 34. 453 sq. Here the plural is common in late prose (ἔλαι ἔλας ἔλαις Strabo, ἔλαι ἔλαις Herodian the historian) and late verse (ἔλαις Babrius ap. Zachariae, ἔλαι Nonnus iii. 69, 252, xvi. 91, xxxvi. 70, ἔλας v. l. Anacreontea 32. 7), but for the good period the evidence consists of two doubtful passages, h. Hom. *Dem.* 386 δάσκιον ἔλης (Mosq.) and Anacreon 51 variously quoted (ἔλαις and ἔλη). To this we may add the place-name ἀπὸ κόμης ἦν καλοῦσιν Ὑλας Strabo 407, Ὑλαι καλούμεναι χωρίον Paus. x. 326 (where Wilamowitz's Ἀἰλαί seems unnecessary), Βοιωτίδες Ὑλαι Moschus iii. 89. The avoidance of the plural in either case is stylistic, due I suppose to a dislike of using the same word as a collective and a plural, a feeling absent in the Latin terra and silva.

If γαῖν is allowed in Aeschylus, I should be inclined to read ἔλης in the Homeric hymn.

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ Γων και οικων *Aegyptische Urkund.* 993, ix. 10 (ap. Herwerden suppl. lex.). Dr. Hunt gives me two instances of γας from the Tebtunis Papyri (Nos. 5. 59, 6. 31), but the plural is not common in papyrus.

NOTES ON THE ATTIC ORATORS.

(Continued from p. 153.)

ANDOCIDES.

1. 17 ὁ δὲ πείσας καὶ δεόμενος μῆναι τὸν πατέρα ἐγὼ ἦν μάλιστα.

Omit καί, δεόμενος being subordinate to πείσας. So in 19 ὁ δὲ πείσας . . ἐγὼ πολλὰ ἱκετεύσας καὶ λαμβανόμενος τῶν γονάτων. Cf. 106 νικήσαντες μαχόμενοι τοὺς τυράννους : 4. 36 τοσαντάκις ἀγωνιζόμενος νικήσας.

ib. 21 ὅπου ἂν ἐμελλεν κ.τ.λ.

ἂν is usually bracketed. Perhaps δῆ. Cf. οὐ δῆ in 2. 16. So perhaps in 81 ἕως δῆ, not ἕως αὐ, should be read for ἕως ἂν.

ib. 119 οὔτε χρήματα ἕτερα οὐτ' εὐτυχίαν ἀνδρὸς ἐλίσσθαι.

<ἐτέρου> ἀνδρός has been conjectured. Read rather ἐτίρου for ἕτερα. For the order of words cf. R. S. Conway in this *Review* xiv. 358-9.

3. 4 εἰρήνη ἐγένετο πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἔτη πενήκοντα καὶ ἐνεμείναμεν . . ταῖς σπονδαῖς ἔτη τρισκαίδεκα.

ib. 6 οὗτοι ἡμῖν εἰρήνην ἐποίησαν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους ἔτη τριάκοντα.

Read after Λακεδαιμονίους in both places <ἐπ'> ἔτη. Peace was made for so many years, but it would not necessarily last so long. The first passage expressly names thirteen years as the actual duration, and ἐγένετο . . ἔτη πενήκοντα would be quite untrue. Cf. Thuc. 3. 68. 5 τὴν δὲ γῆν δημοσιώσαντες ἀπεμίσθωσαν ἐπὶ δέκα ἔτη, etc. Reiske added εἰς, but ἐπ' before ἔτη would be more easily lost.

ib. 9 τὰς τε ἄλλας ἀποικίας καθ' ἕκαστον διηγείσθαι.

καθ' ἕκαστην?

ib. 22 Ἀργείους δὲ ἀγαγόντες εἰς τὴν ποτε φίλιαν.

Rather τότε.

ib. 24 τί οὖν ἔστιν ὑπόλοιπον περὶ ὅτου δεῖ βουλευέσθαι; ναί· περὶ ὧν αὐ ἡμᾶς Ἀργεῖοι προκαλοῦνται.

ναί is no proper answer to τί οὖν ἔστιν ὑπόλοιπον; Read τί οὖν; ἔστιν ὑπόλοιπον περὶ ὅτου κ.τ.λ.; so in 1. 86 ἀρά γε ἔστιν ἐνταυθοῖ

ὅ τι περιελείπετο; and 89 ἐνταυθοῖ ἔστιν ὅ τι ὑπολείπεται;

ib. 34 Read πράττει for πράττοι.

4. 15 τί χρὴ προσδοκᾶν τοῦτον . . διαπράττεσθαι;

διαπράξεσθαι, or add ἂν.

ib. 20 can, I fear, hardly be restored, but it is fairly clear that δέ after κελεύοντος should be γάρ.

LYSIAS.

Unless by any happy chance new evidence should become available, it seems unlikely that any great advance can be made now in dealing with the many and great difficulties presented by the text of Lysias. They offer abundant scope for conjecture, and conjectures have been abundantly made, but these are bound often to depart so far from the MS. readings that no certainty or even great probability can attach to them. The few suggestions here set down hardly touch any of the more serious difficulties.

1. 14 ἔφασκε τὸν λύχρον ἀποσβεσθῆναι . . εἴτα ἐκ τῶν γειτόνων ἐνάψασθαι.

Cobet after Stephanus ἀνάψασθαι. Should we not read ἐναύσασθαι? The middle is not quoted in L. and S. or Veitch from any of the best Attic writers, but there can be no objection to it in the sense here needed of *got a light*.

2. 2 ὥστε καλὰ μὲν πολλὰ τοῖς προτέροις . . εἰρήσθαι, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκείνοις παραλελείφθαι. πολλὰ μὲν καλὰ . . , πολλὰ δέ . . ?

23 The Persians made careful calculation (εἰ μὲν . . εἰ δέ) of various risks. οἱ μὲν τοῖνυν ταῦτα διανοοῦντο. οἱ δ' ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι οὐ λογισμῷ εἰδότες τοὺς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ κινδύνους . . οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐναντίων.

Thalheim gives as the MS. readings 'εἰδότες V X, δόντες F' and cites a number of emendations, none satisfactory. The MS. readings and the sense required seem to point very clearly to λογισμῷ διελόντες. Cf. *Timaeus* 72 A πάντα λογισμῷ διελέσθαι; *Phaedrus* 249 B ἐν λογισμῷ συναυροῦμενον; etc. Cf. also on Lysias 21. 24 below.

25 The words ἔστησαν μὲν . . χώρας seem clearly to have suffered some disturbance of their internal order, but any restoration could only be doubtful.

43 τὴν εὐτυχίαν ὁμοιοῦσαν τοῖς κινδύνοις ἐκτίσαντο.

‘ὁμολογοῦσαν Rs (i.e. Reiske), *sed est: per pericula ad felicitatem et concordiam pervenerunt*’ Thalheim. Surely εὐτυχία ὁμοιοῦσα cannot = εὐτυχία καὶ ὁμοιοῦσα. It may however be a question whether ὁμοίαν οὖσαν would not be better than ὁμολογοῦσαν. Their success did not agree with their danger, but it was as great as their danger.

52 ἀπαντήσαντες αὐτοὶ εἰς τὴν Μεγαρικὴν ἐνίκων μαχομένοι ἀπασαν τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐκείνων τοῖς ἥδῃ ἀπειρηκόσι καὶ τοῖς οὐπω δυναμένοις, τοὺς εἰς τὴν σφετέραν ἐμβαλεῖν ἀξιώσαντας, εἰς τὴν ἀλλοτριαν ἀπαντήσαντες, τρώπαιον δὲ στήσαντες κ.τ.λ.

The speech is much too carefully composed, whoever the author, for it to be probable that ἀπαντήσαντες was repeated in this clumsy way. It may be noticed also that τοὺς . . ἀξιώσαντας is wanting in construction, for it is very awkward to take it in apposition to τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐκείνων. If in apposition at all, it ought to be in the genitive (with ἐκείνων) and not cut off by τοὺς . . δυναμένοις. Perhaps both these faults may be removed together by reading φθάσαντες for ἀπαντήσαντες and taking the latter as an accidental repetition of a word previously used. The construction will then be φθάσαντες εἰς τὴν ἀλλοτριαν τοὺς . . ἀξιώσαντας, anticipating the invader by reaching foreign soil first.

60 εὐτυχὴς δ' ὅς τις Ἀσίας βασιλεὺς ἐτέρων ἡγεμόνων λαβόμενος.

ἐπιλαβόμενος is possible in this sense (Herod. i. 127 Πέρσαι μὲν νυν προστάτεω ἐπιλαβόμενοι ἡλευθεροῦντο), but is the simple verb? In [Dem.] 25. 32 εἰ λάβου' ἐξουσίας is by no means the same as εἰ ἐξουσίαν λάβοι, but like Plato *Rep.* 360 D τοιαύτης ἐξουσίας ἐπιλαβόμενος. Cf. however προσλαμβάνεσθαι.

Blass' arguments against Lysias as the author of this speech do not carry complete conviction. When we have made allowance for the interval that would inevitably divide the deliberately dignified style of a funeral oration from the deliberately plain, almost colloquial style which Lysias adopted in his ordinary forensic speeches, there seems to be nothing in the speech which he might not have put there. If it has all the faults of taste which Blass finds

in it, I do not know why Lysias should be thought incapable of committing them. When a plain writer ventures on an elevated style, he may well fall into such faults. Xenophon in such cases fell into worse, if all the work attributed to him is authentic. On the other hand I would not maintain with any great confidence that Lysias was really the author. I would only say that no very strong case is made out against it.

I do not know whether the following words have been pointed out as rising above or departing from the usual vocabulary of the orators: 5 κλέος and χάριν with genitive, a construction hardly used in the purest prose: 7 ἀσεβείσθαι passive: 21 στέλλω: 24 ἀξιοῦν *think*: 27 ἀπαθὴς κακῶν (frequent in Herodotus): 37 δεξιούσθαι: 42 ἐρίζω: 50 γεραίτεροι: 60 λαβόμενος (this use is however not even poetical; see above): 64 ἀδελφός as metaphorical adjective: 69 εὐκτός: 74 λήγω: 75 τοκεύς: 77 χείριστος: 79 ἀγύρατος. Some of these will be found in Xenophon, Plato, or Thucydides, hardly in the orators. Less noticeable are πενθεῖν (several times, e.g. 2), φήμη (3), μαιῖνω (7), ἐξυβρίζω (9). ἀείμνηστος (20) occurs also in 6. 25 (thought not to be Lysias) and 26. 4, but is uncommon. Lysias seems not to use elsewhere δὲ ταχέων (26), but it occurs three times in the speeches ascribed to Demosthenes and I dare say elsewhere in oratory. οἱ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐντός (50) is worth noticing for the sense of ἐντός (see L. and S.) and for its position.

4. 7 νῦν δὲ ὁμολογοῦμέθα πρὸς παῖδας καὶ αὐλητρίδας καὶ μετ' οἶνον ἐλθόντες ὥστε πῶς ταῦτ' ἐστὶ πρόνοια;

Something like ὁμολογοῦμέθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχοντες > παῖδας καὶ αὐλητρίδας καὶ μετ' οἶνον ἐλθεῖν?

4. 11 τοῖς τ' ἄλλοις ἐμφανὲς καὶ τοῖτοις ποιῆσαι.

In the context τοῖτοις seems wrong, but it would be better to substitute οὕτως than Thalheim's δὲ αὐτῆς.

12. 11 ἐδεόμην αὐτοῦ ἐφόδια μοι δοῦναι, ὃ δ' ἀγαπήσειν με ἔφασκεν, εἰ τὸ σῶμα σώσω.

Pison did not say that Lysias would be content. Lysias' request showed that he would not. He said he *ought* to be content, i.e. ἀγαπᾶν, δεήσειν με. For two words thus run into one cf. Plato *Soph.* 257 E ἐνμβέβηκεναι for ἐνμβέβηκεν εἶναι: *Theaet.* 185 D ὀργανίδιον for ὄργανον ἴδιον: *Phileb.* 41 A ὑστεροῦμεν for ὑστερον ἐροῦμεν: *Thuc.* 8. 67. 2 ἀνεπτεῖν and ἀνατρέπειν for ἀνατὶ εἰπεῖν: *Diod.*

14. 56. 6 προεθυμούντο for προθύμους ἐποιοῦντο: etc. Cf. on Lysurgus 131 below.

12. 21 πολλοὺς δ' ἐπιτίμους ὄντας ἀτίμους [τῆς πόλεως] κατέστησαν.

So Thalheim, but where did τῆς πόλεως come from? Perhaps we should read ἀτίμους τῆς πολιτείας, though the word is no doubt superfluous. Cf. Dem. 15. 33 ἀτιμος τοῦ συμβουλευεῖν: Thuc. 3. 58. 6 ἀτίμους γερώων.

12. 35 μαθόντες ἀπίασιν ὅτι ἡ δίκην δώσουσιν . . ἡ κ.τ.λ.

There is no sense in ὅτι ἡ here. The men will find out *whether* they are to suffer or the reverse, not *that* they are to do one or the other. We must read εἴτε or πότερον.

12. 60 καὶ πόλεις ἐπάγοντες <ἄλλας τε> καὶ τελευτῶντας Λακεδαιμονίους?

13. 18 οὐ γὰρ δῆπον ἐκεῖνοι οὕτως ἀνόητοι ᾤσαν καὶ ἄφιλοι ὥστε κ.τ.λ.

For καὶ read ἡ. So in the closely parallel passage Lysurg. 68 οὕτως ἐστὶν ἀνόητος καὶ παντάπασιν ἡμῶν καταπεφρονηκώς Blass reads ἡ for καί.

13. 46 τὴν ἀρόπολιν ἡμῶν εἶχον. Half a dozen aorists preceding and following strongly suggest ἔσχον. The mistake is quite frequent.

13. 71 For οἶδε (Dobree εἶδε) I would suggest ἦδει. A past tense seems much more suitable.

13. 82 ὑπολαμβάνειν χρὴ εἰ Ἄνυτος αὐτῷ ἐγένετο αἴτιος μὴ ἀποθανεῖν.

Should not εἰ be ὅτι?

19. 20 ἦσαν δ' ἐλπίδες τοῦ πλοῦ πείσαι Διονύσιον κ.τ.λ.

Perhaps <ἐκ> τοῦ πλοῦ. So perhaps in 2. 61 <ἐν> καινοῖς κυδύνοις after πεισθέντες.

20. 3 οὗτος δὲ τίνος ἂν ἔνεκα ὀλιγαρχίας ἐπεθύμῃσε; πότερον ὡς ἡλικίαν εἶχε λέγων τι διαπράττεσθαι παρ' ἑμίν, ἢ τῷ σώματι πιστεύων, ἵνα ὑβρίξω εἰς τῶν ὑμετέρων τινά; ἀλλ' ὁρᾶτε αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἣ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἱκανὸς ἐστὶν ἀποτρέπειν τούτων.

I cannot make any sense of ὡς ἡλικίαν εἶχε. Does not the speaker say ironically ὡς ἡλικίαν <οὐκ> εἶχε? 'Was it that he was not old enough to have the right of speaking, or that he was young and physically strong?' the point being that he was really by no means young.

20. 5 εἴ τις ὀλίγας ἄρξας.

ὀλίγας is certainly strange. Perhaps, as elsewhere, it has got exchanged for πολλὰς through a certain similarity.

20. 12 ὅτ' ἐξέτινε τῷ δημοσίῳ, οὐκ εἰσήνεγκεν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀργύριον.

But why should he have contributed the whole sum? Omit τό (due to last letters of αὐτῷ), or read τοῦ ἀργυρίου.

Just below ἐστὶ ἐν ἡμῶν ἐστὶ πολίτης seems a mistake for ἦν. How can the present tense be used of a dead man?

20. 24 ὥστε τῇ θεῷ τε τὰς δεκάτας ἐξαίρεθῆναι πλέον ἢ τριάκοντα μνᾶς καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

After στρατιώταις a numeral, representing a sum of money, would seem to have been lost.

21. 24 For the unsuitable ἡλέησα read probably ἔδωκα (Δ for Δ).

22. 11 οἶμαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἐλείψεσθαι.

For the unattic ἐλείψεσθαι such words as τρέψεσθαι, πορεύσεσθαι, καταφεύξεσθαι have been proposed. I take it to be perhaps a gloss rather than a corruption, and suggest ἀπαντήσῃ, as in *Midias* 151 ἐπὶ ταῦτα δ' ἀπῆντων, ὡς κ.τ.λ.

In *fragm.* 47 ἐρχομένων can hardly be right either. (Cf. on Antiphon, *supra* p. 148 and on Isocrates *Apophthegms* below.)

23. 5 Probably μάλιστα <ἂν> ὥσμον εἰ δέναι.

24. 3 οἶμαι δὲ . . τὰ τοῦ σώματος δυστυχήματα τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἰσθῆναι καλῶς.

καλοῖς Markland, which will not quite do. Read καλοῖς <οὔσιν>. After οὔσιν was lost, καλοῖς was turned into an adverb.

26. 21 Θρασιβοῦλῳ ὃς αὐτῷ ἀπολογίσηται.

The dative is odd. Should βοηθῶν be added? That is at least as likely as αὐτοῦ ὑπεραπολογίσηται (Reiske) or αὐτῷ ἀναβήσεται (Halbertsma). Cf. for instance 14. 21 and 22.

30. 19 ὅστις ἀξίῳ πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια θύειν, ἔπειτα ἂ μᾶλλον συμφέροι τῇ πόλει.

For μᾶλλον, which seems without point, πάλαι and μάλιστα have been proposed. Perhaps ἂ μέλλει συμφέρειν.

33. 4 εἰδότες ὅτι φιλονικεῖν μὲν ἔστιν εὖ πραττόντων, γνῶναι δὲ τὰ βέλτιστα τῶν αὐτῶν.

αὐτῶν has been altered in a variety of ways. Such conjectures as ἀτυχοῦντων (Markland) and κακῶς (Cobet) seem from the context to give the probable meaning, but I would suggest φανῶς as coming nearer to the letters of αὐτῶν.

Fragments.

1. 4 Write τοῦ (for τούτου) τεθνεώτος.

4 καὶ εἰ μὲν χρῶτο καὶ ἔχοι Ἀλκιβιάδης, Ἀξιώχου ἔφασκεν εἶναι θυγατέρα· εἰ δὲ Ἀξίохος, Ἀλκιβιάδου.

Surely ἔφασκεν, 'they said.'

15 τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ γένος ἄρχεται, τὸ δὲ σὸν ἐν σοὶ παύεται.

παύσεται?

111 τὴν μὲν κόμην ψιλὴν ἔχεις, τὰς δὲ μασχάλας δασείας.

Is κόμην a slip for κεφαλὴν? how can long hair, or any hair, be ψιλή?

ISOCRATES.

1. 5 οὐ παράκλησιν εὐρόντες ἀλλὰ παραίνεσιν γράφοντες μέλλομέν σοι συμβουλεύειν.

There is no propriety in the expression παράκλησιν εὐρεῖν, find an exhortation, or even devise. But εὐρεῖν and εἰπεῖν sometimes get confused. See C.R. xviii. 11, noting further that Dem. 8. 54 has εἰπεῖν while 10. 56 has εὐρεῖν and that in Isocr. 2. 41 the Urbinas has εἰπεῖν against εὐρεῖν in other MSS. Read therefore here εἰπόντες, which is much more pointed, for it carries on the reference of § 1 to Isocrates and the family of Demoniacs being now separated. He must therefore not speak but write. So ἐπαίνους εἰπών 12. 130 etc.

15 ἡγοῦ μάλιστα σεαντῷ πρέπειν κόσμον αἰσχύνην, δικαιοσύνην, σωφροσύνην· τούτοις γὰρ ἅπασι δοκεῖ κοσμεῖσθαι τὸ τῶν νεωτέρων ἦθος.

Blass (Teubner 1879) bracketed κόσμον, turning κρατεῖσθαι into κοσμεῖσθαι; and this may be right. But perhaps πρέπειν should be πρέποντα.

25 μήτε μετὰ βλάβης περὶ τῶν φίλων μήτ' ἀπειρος εἶναι τῶν ἐταίρων ἔθελε. τοῦτο δὲ ποιήσεις, ἐὰν μὴ δεόμενος [τὸ?] δεῖσθαι προσποιῇ. περὶ τῶν ῥητῶν ὡς ἀπορρήτων ἀνακινουῦν μὴ τυχῶν μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν βλαβήσκει, τυχῶν δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτῶν τὸν τρόπον ἐπιστήσει.

It is surprising that critics have not seen the irrelevance of περὶ τῶν ῥητῶν ὡς ἀπορρήτων ἀνακινουῦν here. μὴ τυχῶν κ.τ.λ. evidently follows προσποιῇ. The intervening words, which merely disturb the sequence, must be put either earlier or later; probably earlier, as they could not conveniently come later for some time, whereas they might quite well stand before μήτε μετὰ βλάβης. τό should probably be omitted.

28 περὶ τὸν πλοῦτον χρήματα καὶ <μὴ> (Blass) κτήματα κατασκευάζειν· ἔστι δὲ χρήματα μὲν τοῖς ἀπολαύειν ἐπισταμένοις, κτήματα δὲ τοῖς κτᾶσθαι <μόνον> (Blass) δυναμένοις.

μὴ must no doubt be inserted, but I am not so sure about μόνον, rather suspecting that here too the words have got out of their order. Did I. write ἔστι δὲ κτήματα μὲν τ. κ. δ., χρήματα δὲ τ. ἀ. ἐ.? The similarity of κτήματα and χρήματα might lead to the error.

31 μηδὲ παρὰ . . μηδὲ παρὰ.

Perhaps μήτε in both places.

2. 45 See C.R. xii. 28.

3. 59 μετὰ τοιαύτης ψυχῆς ἡδιστ' ἂν τις δύναιτο τὸν βίον διαγαγεῖν.

The present tense διάγειν seems almost necessary. So in Gorgias 486 A ἀπάγοι must be right as against ἀπαγάγοι.

5. 1 μὴ θανάσης, ὦ Φίλιππε, διότι τοῦ λόγον ποιήσομαι τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐ τοῦ πρὸς σέ ῥηθησομένου καὶ νῦν δειχθήσεσθαι μέλλοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ περὶ Ἀμφιπόλεως γραφέντος.

I cannot translate these words as they stand, but conjecture οὐκ <ἐκ> τοῦ. The cause of the loss is obvious.

7. 20 ἡγείσθαι τὴν μὲν ἀκολασίαν δημοκρατίαν, τὴν δὲ παρανομίαν ἐλευθερίαν, τὴν δὲ παρρησίαν ἰσονομίαν, τὴν δ' ἐξουσίαν τοῦ ταῦτα ποιεῖν εὐδαιμονίαν.

ταῦτα seems without meaning. πάντα, sometimes confused with it, is exactly what we want, πάντα ποιεῖν being a familiar combination.

54 χειμάζοντας ἐν τοιούτοις ἐν οἷς οὐ βούλομαι λέγειν.

This is certainly unlike the usual form of expression, which would be either ἐν τοιούτοις οἷς (or ᾧ) or ἐν οἷς simply. Should we omit the second ἐν, which indeed hardly makes sense?

8. 12 ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τῇ πόλει κινδυνεύοντες.

Perhaps for *ἐν* we should write *ἀν*. Cf. 47 τοῖς αὐτῶν σώμασιν . . κινδυνεύειν.

13 ὅταν δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐκκλησιάζητε, τοῖς μὲν τοιοῦτοις ἀπιστεῖτε καὶ φθονεῖτε, τοὺς δὲ πονηροτάτους τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα παριόντων ἀσκέετε καὶ νομίζετε δημοτικωτέρους τοὺς μεθύοντας τῶν νηφόντων.

In Demosthenes *Ol.* 3. 28 and *F.L.* 339 I have suggested (*C.R.* xvii. 147 : xviii. 13) changing ἡσκήκαμεν and συνασκέειν to ἡξήκαμεν and συναύξειν respectively. Here in the same way there seems little sense in ἀσκέετε and I suggest αὐξέτε. αὐξώ or αὐξάνω is used in much the same sense 5. 120 ὅπου δ' ἰάσων λόγῳ μόνον χρησάμενος οὕτως αὐτὸν ἡξήσῃ, ποῖαν τινὰ χρὴ προσδοκᾶν περὶ σοῦ γνώμην ἄπαντας ἔξειν κ.τ.λ. ; Cf. Plato *Lysis* 206 A οἱ καλοὶ, ἐπειδὴν τις αὐτοὺς ἐπαινῇ καὶ αὐξῇ, φρονήματος ἐμπίμπλονται. So sometimes *augeo* in Latin and *raise* in English ('while wits and Templars every sentence raise'). Or we may take αὐξέτε in its more usual sense and compare [*Xen.*] *R.A.* 1. 14 τοὺς μὲν χρηστοὺς ἀτιμοῦσι . . τοὺς δὲ πονηροὺς αὐξουσιν. But Isocrates' form of the word was αὐξάνω rather than αὐξώ, if MSS. may be trusted.

114 ἦν τὰς αὐτὰς πράξεις ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν ὁμοίων φαίνονται γνωρίζοντες.

So the two best MSS. (Blass), but the rest appear to have ὁμοίως for τῶν ὁμοίων. Should we explain and reconcile the discrepancy by reading τῶν ὁμοίων ὁμοίως?

9. 47 τὴν πόλιν . . οὔτε τέχνας ἐπισταμένην οὔτ' ἐμπορίῃ χρωμένην οὔτε λιμένα κεκτημένην.

Rather ἐμπορίᾳ.

54 τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἦν φύσει πατρὶς (ἡ ἡμετέρα πόλις), τὸν δὲ . . νόμῳ πολίτην ἐπεποιήητο.

Surely ἐπεποιήητο.

10. 8 τολμῶσι γράφειν ὡς ἔστιν ὁ τῶν πτωχόντων καὶ φενγόντων βίος ζηλωτότερος ἢ ὁ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων.

Blass follows Benseler in omitting ὁ after ἦ, so as to get rid of the hiatus. Kayser had omitted ἦ . . ἀνθρώπων altogether. Without ὁ the grammar of the sentence is, I think, questionable. Perhaps we might regard ἦ ὁ as an explanatory adscript and read by the common Greek idiom ζηλωτότερος τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, as in Democritus (*fragment* 98 Diels) ἐνὸς φιλήν ξυνετοῦ κρέσων ἀξυνέτων πάντων : *Xen. Hiero* 1. 38 ἐξεικάζουσιν ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς τῶν φιλοῦντων ὑπουργαίς : *Ar. Eth.* 3. 10. 10 φάρνγγα μακροτέρην γεράνου : Isocrates himself 2. 31 τὸ τῆς πόλεως ὅλης ἡθος

ὁμοιοῦται τοῖς ἄρχουσιν : 11. 7 πότερα τοῖς περὶ Αἰόλου λεγομένοις αὐτὸν παρατάξωμεν ; and many examples in all authors.

11. 5 ἀπολογήσασθαι should be ἀπολογήσεσθαι.

12. 36 ἀγνοῶ should be ἀγνοῶν. Otherwise there is no construction for εἰδώς and εἰρηκώς.

131 See *C.R.* xii. 131.

15. 28 ὦν οὐδέν μοι πλεόν γεγενον.

Is this Greek? must we not read <ἐξ> ὦν?

133 ὁρᾶς δὲ τὴν φύσιν τὴν τῶν πολλῶν ὡς διακείται πρὸς τὰς ἡδονάς.

Perhaps διακείται. Cf. however the somewhat surprising expression in *Acharnians* 370 τοὺς τρόπους τοὺς τῶν ἀγροίκων οἶδα χαίροντας σφόδρα, ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.

16. 26 γιγνομένης, not γενομένης, seems required by the expression ὅποτε τάκεινων κρατήσκειν, οὐ . . κατέσκαπτον ἀλλὰ . . ἀνώρυττον.

40 παρὰ τῆς πόλεως does not seem to make very good sense in the context, and I should prefer περὶ.

43. ὑπάρξει would suit both ὅπότεν δόξῃ and the future following better than ὑπάρχει does.

17. 6 ἡγοῖμην . . κινδυνεύειν . . γενήσεσθαι is not, I think, possible Greek. Read κινδυνεύσειν (or κινδυνεύειν ἂν) . . γενέσθαι. In 7 again not ποιεῖν but ποιήσειν must be read after προσομολογεῖν.

Ep. 4. 4 συνημερεῦσαι καὶ συμβιβῶναι πάντων ἡδιστον καὶ λιγυρώτατον.

This use of λιγυρός is both unique and unintelligible. May we not suppose a corruption of ἰλαρώτατον?

Ep. 9. 6 ῥᾶν ἐστὶ περὶ τῶν γεγεννημένων εὐπόρως ἐπιδραμεῖν ἢ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων νουεχόντως εἰπεῖν.

εὐπόρως seems unsuitable, but neither ἐπικικώς nor ἀνεκτώς (suggested by Dobree) is satisfactory. I would propose ἀπόνως. εὐ- and ἀ- are not unfrequently confused, and πόρος also gets exchanged with πόνος, e.g. in *Aeneas Comm. Pol.* 14. 2.

In the 'Apophthegms' put together in Blass' edition, two or three small improvements may be made.

Ἐρωτηθεὶς τίνοι οἱ φιλόπονοι τῶν ῥαθύμων

διαφέρουσιν εἶπεν 'ὡς οἱ εὐσεβεῖς τῶν ἀσεβῶν, ἐλπίσιν ἀγαθαῖς.

Is it not plain that ὡς should be $\delta\eta$? cf. Bywater (*Textual Criticism of Nic. Ethics*) on *Eth.* 1106 b 36 ὡς (or ψ) ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσειεν.

οἱ ἄνθρωποι τότε γίνονται βελτίους, ὅταν θεῷ προσέρχωνται· ὁμοιον δὲ ἔχουσι θεῷ τὸ εὐεργετεῖν καὶ ἀληθεύειν. Ἰσοκράτους.

Of course I. did not use προσέρχωνται, but neither, I take it, did he say βελτίους. βέλτιστοι is almost required by the sense, and no confusion is more common than that of comparatives and superlatives.

In πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα πατέρα ὡς οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἢ ἀνδράποδον συνέπεμψε τῷ παιδίῳ, 'τοιγαροῦν' ἔφη 'ἄπιθι, δύο γὰρ ἄνθ' ἐνὸς ἔξεις ἀνδράποδα' no doubt οὐδὲν should be οὐδέν', and perhaps συνέπεμψε should be συμπίμψαι.

In the extract (6) from the *Τέχνη* read τὸ (not τὸν) ἐπόμενον.

ISAEUS.

1. 33 ὥστε μὴδὲ λόγον ὑπολείψειν.

Read ὑπολείπειν, comparing Goodwin *M.T.* § 591.

3. 72 γυνῶναι ὅσον ἀναισχυντότατοι ἀνθρώπων εἰσιν οὗτοι.

Rather ὅσῳ, the regular case with comparatives and superlatives.

4. 18 εἰκὸς ἦν ἀληθεῖς εἶναι δόξειν τὰς διαθήκας.

εἰκὸς seldom, if ever, takes a future infinitive, just as it very seldom takes ἄν. Read δοκεῖν.

5. 14 ἡμεῖς δὲ κατηγοροῦμενοι οὐκέτι προσήκειν κ.τ.λ.

ἄθ' ἡγοῦμενοι (Baiter) is not likely to be right, ἄτε being little used in common Attic prose. καὶ ἡγοῦμενοι may be suggested.

6. 50 ἰδεῖν ἂ οὐκ ἐξὸν αὐτῇ.

Read ἐξῆν. We might think of omitting ἂ, but ἰδεῖν needs an object. [So too Wyse.]

7. 8 ἕως οὗ εὐπορήσειεν ἐκείνος τὰργύριον.

ἕως οὗ, if right, is very unusual. It occurs Herod. 2. 143, but probably not elsewhere in Attic. The occasional use of μέχρι οὗ in Thuc. and Xen. is parallel, but their Attic is not of the scrupulous kind we expect in Isaeus.

9. 21 οὐδέποτε, referring to the past, should probably be οὐδέπωποτε.

Fragm. 32 χρὴ τοὺς νόμους μὲν τίθεσθαι σφοδρῶς, πρῶτέρως δὲ κολάζειν ἢ ὡς ἐκείνοι κελεύουσιν.

I suspect σφοδρῶς is due to πρῶτέρως and Isaeus wrote σφοδρούς.

LYCURGUS.

13 πρὸς ὃ δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀποβλέποντας μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν τοῖς ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος λέγουσιν· οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται τοῖς τε κρινομένοις ἄνευ διαβολῆς ὁ ἀγὼν καὶ τοῖς διώκουσιν ἥκιστα συκοφαντεῖν καὶ ὑμῖν εὐορκωτάτην ψήφον ἐνεγκεῖν· ἀδύνατον γάρ ἐστιν ἄνευ τοῦ λόγου μὴ δικαίως δεδιδαγμένους δικαίαν θέσθαι τὴν ψήφον.

Multi multa coniecerunt, says Blass, *velut* ἄνευ τοῦ ἀλόγου *G. Herm.*, ἄνευ τοῦ < τοιούτου > λόγου *Nicolai*. *An* ἄνευ τοῦ λόγου (*quod facile in λόγου abibat*) δικαίως δεδιδάχθαι!

I take ἄνευ to be a careless repetition of the ἄνευ preceding (ἄνευ διαβολῆς) and to have taken the place of ἔξω, 'after listening to irrelevant and unfair speeches.' So ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος in the first clause. We might compare Maine's remark about an English jury in *Popular Government*, 'there is a rigid exclusion of all testimony which has a tendency to bias them unfairly.'

28 καὶ ταῦτα δ', ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐμοῦ θεωρήσατε, ὡς δικαίαν τὴν ἐξέτασιν ποιουμένου περὶ τούτων.

καὶ ταῦτα refers to what is coming. Should not ποιουμένου be ποιούμεαι? He wants them to observe how scrupulously he is proceeding.

29 Read τὸν τῶν πάντα (for τὸν παρὰ τῶν) συνειδόντων ἔλεγχον. [Dr. Postgate tells me that Herwerden has made the same conjecture with αὐτῷ after πάντα.]

30 Keeping τοὺς ἰδίους κινδύνους add perhaps ὑπομένων. Cf. ὑπέμεινεν following and οὐδένα κίνδυνον ὑπομείνας in 78.

32 οὕτως δὲ διαλογίζεσθε περὶ τούτων παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς. τίνας ἀδύνατον ἦν τῇ δεινότητι καὶ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς ταῖς τοῦ λόγου παραγαγεῖν; κατὰ φύσιν τοίνυν βασανιζόμενοι πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἐμελλον φράσειν οἱ οἰκέται καὶ αἱ θεράπαιναι. ἀλλὰ τούτους Λεωκράτης παραδούναί ἐφυγε, καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἄλλοτρίους ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ όντας. τίνας δὲ δυνατόν εἶναι δοκεῖ τοῖς λόγοις ψυχαγωγῆσαι καὶ τὴν ὑγρότητα αὐτῶν τοῦ ἥθους τοῖς δακρύοις εἰς ἔλεον προαγαγέσθαι; τοὺς δικαστάς. ἐνταῦθα Λεωκράτης ὁ προδότης τῆς πατρίδος ἐγλήνυεν, οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ φοβούμενος μὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οἰκίας οἱ τ' ἐξελέγχοντες τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ ὁ ἐξελεγχόμενος γένηται.

There seem to me to be at least two things wrong here. First the question τίνας ἀδύνατον

ἦν κ.τ.λ. has no answer made to it, although κατὰ φύσιν τοίνυν κ.τ.λ. is incoherent without something to precede it and although symmetry with τοὺς δικαστάς, which answers the parallel question, requires a corresponding accusative. Insert therefore as an answer after παραγαγεῖν something like οἱ δοῦλοι. Secondly the words οὐδὲν ἕτερον . . γένηται appear to be entirely irrelevant where they occur. They have no sort of connexion with rhetorical artifices addressed to the court. Clearly they refer to the domestics mentioned in the first half of the passage, and their place is after αὐτοῦ ὄντας. In Blass' text will be found one or two other similar transpositions (§§ 14 and 43).

There is said (Rehdantz) to be no parallel for οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ instead of the usual οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ, and this suggests the possibility that Lycurgus wrote οὐδὲν ἕτερον (or πρότερον, §§ 92, 129) φοβούμενος ἢ. But the text is probably right.

40 ὅρᾶν δ' ἦν . . γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας . . ἀναξίως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὀρωμένας.

ὀρωμένας may be defensible in itself (cf. for instance Lys. 3. 6: Eur. *Androm.* 878) but as governed immediately by ὅρᾶν it is surely intolerable. How to deal with it is another question. If it is an ordinary corruption of some more or less similar word, ὀδωρομένας (which is suggested) or ὀλοφυρομένας is likely enough to be right. Anything rather than Rehdantz' ὀρωμένας. If however it is due to ὅρᾶν preceding and to ἰδεῖν and ὅρᾶν following, all in one sentence, it may represent some quite different word no more like ὀρωμένας than in 13 above ἀνεν is like ἔξω; and then conjecture is almost idle.

57 ἡδέως δ' ἂν αὐτοῦ πνυθίμην τίν' ἐμπορίαν εἰσάγων χρησιμώτερος ἐγένετ' ἂν τῇ πόλει τοῦ παρασχεῖν τὸ σῶμα τάξει τοῖς στρατηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐπιόντας ἀμύνασθαι μετ' ὅμων μαχόμενος.

τοῦ παρασχεῖν (= ἢ τῷ παρασχεῖν) is so awkward a phrase, when the speaker had only to say ἢ παρέχων, that I would suggest τίν' ἐμπορίαν εἰσάγειν χρησιμώτερον . . τοῦ παρασχεῖν . . καὶ . . ἀμύνασθαι . . μαχόμενον. Or we might read ἢ τῷ παρασχεῖν, taking ἢ as lost after εἰ.

67 οὐ τοῦτο λογιέσθε, εἰ εἰς ἐστὶ μόνος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ πρᾶγμα.

Blass writes 'ἀλλ' οἷον τὸ πρ. Bk., ἀλλ' εἰ (Tayl.) τὸ πρ. μέγα (Dobr.), ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ πρ. <ἀποβλέψετε> Frohb.'

It is well known that εἰς and τις are sometimes confused. Does not εἰς here stand for τίς?

73 καί, τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς νίκης, οὐ τὸ ἐν Σαλαμῖνι τρόπαιον ἀγαπήσαντες ἐστήσαν, ἀλλ' ὅρους τοῖς βαρβάροις πῆξαντες . . συνθήκας ἐποιήσαντο.

ἀγ. ἐστ. is such an unnatural phrase 'did not set up the trophy, contenting themselves with it,' that Blass follows Meutzner in omitting ἐστήσαν altogether. Should we not rather exchange verb and participle, reading ἡγάπησαν στήσαντες? So in Ar. *Ach.* 91 the Ravenna MS. in spite of metre has ἤκοντες ἀγομεν for ἀγοντες ἤκομεν: *Od.* 17. 245 one MS. has ὑβρίζεις φορέον for ὑβρίζων φορέεις: *Alcib.* ii. 138 A Bodl. has πορευόμενος προσεύξει for προσευξόμενος πορεύει: and many passages have been or are to be restored in this way.

74 τοὺς κακοὺς μισεῖν τε καὶ κολάζειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ Λεωκράτην, ὃς οὔτε εἰσεῖεν οὔτε ἤρχινθη ἑμᾶς.

Is there any parallel for such a use of ἄλλως τε καί? It introduces adverbial expressions, especially *as, especially when, especially if*, etc. Can Δ., a simple objective accusative, be placed after it? or should we read ἄλλους τε καί? I confess τοὺς τε ἄλλους καί is rather what one would expect.

76 For ἀμείνω read μείζω. *C.R.* xvi. 394.

93 Callistratus, who was told by the god at Delphi ὅτι ἂν ἔλθῃ Ἀθήναζε τεύξεταί τῶν νόμων, returned there and was put to death, δικαίως: τὸ γὰρ τῶν νόμων τοῖς ἡδικοῦσι τυχεῖν τιμωρία ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ γε θεὸς ὀρθῶς ἀπέδωκε τοῖς ἡδικομένοις κολάσαι τὸν αἴτιον· δεινὸν γὰρ ἂν εἴη, εἰ ταῦτ' αἰετὰ τοῖς εὐσεβεῖσι καὶ τοῖς κακοῦργοις φαίνονται (φαίνονται MSS.).

If Bursian and Blass are right in reading τιμωρίας for τιμωρία, I think we must go a step further and insert another τυχεῖν either before or after, τοῖς ἡδικοῦσι. Clearly it would very easily get lost.

But the last words of the passage are the real difficulty, εἰ ταῦτ' αἰετὰ κ.τ.λ. We may probably accept φαίνονται or something like it, but ταῦτ' αἰετὰ is very obscure. Why should not the same signs be given to pious men and evil-doers? or what is meant in this context by 'the same signs'? The real point is that the god, as was his way, used an ambiguous or equivocal expression. The speaker must be defending him not for having given 'the same sign' to righteous and unrighteous, but for having given a 'sign' or intimation which might bear more than one meaning, the sense intended varying with the character of the man to whom it was given. Just then as it seems very

possible that one *τυχῶν* out of two fell out above, so here I would suggest εἰ ταῦτα <ταύτου> σημεῖα . . φαίνονται, i.e. gave the same signs in the same sense, did not make the meaning vary with the man. ταὐτὸ σημαίνοντα or ταύτου σημεῖα might also be suggested, but ταῦτα ταύτου perhaps expresses it best.

106 κατέλιπεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐλεγεία ποιήσας.

Are the words in their right order? ποιήσας γάρ . . κατέλιπεν? or ἐλεγεία . . κατέλιπε ποιήσας?

123 τοὺς ἐπιχειρήσαντας τὴν . . σωτηρίαν ἀποστέρειν?

131 ὡς ὑπὲρ ταύτης μαχοῦμενοι ἢ κοινῇ . . συνατυχοῦντες.

Dobree and editors συνατυχοῦντες to match μαχοῦμενοι. Possibly συνατυχεῖν ἀξιοῦντες. Cf. on Lysias 12. 11.

140 ἡγοῦμαι δ' ἔγωγε οὐδέν' [ἀν] οὗτω μεγάλα τὴν πόλιν εὐεργετηκέναι, ὥστ' ἐξαίρετον ἀξιοῦν λαμβάνειν χάριν τὴν κατὰ τῶν προδιδόντων τιμωρίαν, οὐδ' οὕτως ἀνόητον ὥστε κ.τ.λ.

At the beginning of 139 he has expressly said that certain persons on the ground of their own public services are trying to beg L. off. It is impossible therefore that the words before us, in which he declares that no one could do such a thing, should be right. Blass accordingly brackets ἀξιοῦν; but how did it get into the text? I think as a corruption of ἀξίων εἶναι, which makes excellent sense ('no one's past services are such that he is entitled' etc.) and has the further merit of smoothing οὐδ' οὕτως ἀνόητον, where an εἶναι is rather lacking.

In the following passages it seems to me that something has been omitted.

73 ὅρους τοῖς βαρβάροις πῆξαντες τοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

105 ὥστε τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λακεδαιμονίοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις τυχοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνέειλεν ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ.

143 καὶ ἔασαι αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.

Surely for prose τοῖς ἀνδρειοτάτοις Λ. is not good Greek, or is at any rate very unusual Greek. An epithet is not thus attached to a proper name, or very seldom. It seems likely that γενομένους or οὔσι, going with ἀνδρειοτάτους, has been lost. After one of the plural datives οὔσι would very easily fall out. [Naber has recently suggested ἀνδρειότατα, omitting Λακεδαιμονίους.]

In 73 τοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν seems incomplete without the addition of some such word as συμφέροντας, ἐπιτηδείους, ἱκανούς. In 143 I conjecture καὶ <δεήσεται> ἔασαι, where again a certain similarity might facilitate loss. The force of ἀξιώσει is difficult to carry over the ἡμεῖς δ' ἐρωτᾶτε coming between.

So again in 18 ὥσπερ τῇ πατρίδι μεγάλας εὐτυχίας εὐαγγελιζόμενος it is hard to believe that the dative really depends on εὐτυχίας, pieces of good fortune for his country, when any hearer or reader would naturally attach it to εὐαγγελιζόμενος. Here too some participle like γενομένης or συμβάσας has perhaps been lost.

Two very small points in conclusion. In 2 τὸν μῆτε προδόντα μῆτ' ἐγκαταλιπόντα might be better than Dobree's μῆτε προδόντα μῆτ' ἐγκαταλιπόντα, Cf. the τόν in 1, which is also bracketed, I think needlessly. In 96 τὸ χωρίον . . προσαγορεύεσθαι τῶν εἰσεβῶν χώρων is not <τὸν> τῶν wanted?

AESCHINES.

In *Timarch.* 29 τῇ πόλει, ὑπὲρ ἧς τὰ ὅπλα μὴ τίθεσθαι ἢ διὰ δειλίαν μὴ δυνατὸς εἰ ἐπαμύναι, μῆδὲ συμβουλεύειν ἀξίον.

The two alternatives in the relative clause seem hardly to make sense, as διὰ δειλίαν would surely apply to τὰ ὅπλα μὴ τίθεσθαι too. Either put ἢ after δειλίαν or change it to καί, for which it does sometimes get substituted and *vice versa*.

De F. L. 177 ἀτιμοὶ δ' ἐκ συκοφαντίας <ὄντες>?

In *Ctes.* 4 τὸ . . κήρυγμα . . 'τίς ἀγορεύει βούλεται τῶν ὑπὲρ πενήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων καὶ πάλιν ἐν μέρει τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων';

So the editors give these words, but the quotation really ends at γεγονότων. This is both clear in itself (for the whole as one question or proclamation would be ludicrous) and made still clearer by what Aeschines says elsewhere (in *Timarch.* 23) μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπερωτᾷ ὁ κήρυξ 'τίς ἀ. β. τ. ὑ. π. ἐ. γ.?' ἐπεὶ δὲ οὗτοι πάντες εἰπωσι, τότε ἡδὴ κελεύει λέγειν τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων τὸν βουλούμενον οἷς ἔξεστιν. In *Alcid. Soph.* 11 we have the abbreviated form τίς ἀγορεύει βούλεται τῶν πολιτῶν;

153 γένεσθε δὴ μοι μικρὸν χρόνον τὴν διάνοιαν μὴ ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ.

'Malim τῇ διανοίᾳ, ut § 157, 186, Plato *legg.* 683 c Bait. sed cf. 1. § 179 (ἐπεὶ δὲ δ'

ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπολογίας ἀποσπασθῆτε καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐφ' ἐτέρων γένησθε).¹ Zürich ed.

I think the dative should be read here and in 1. 179. Cf. Aristotle, *Fragm.* 58 (Rose) εἴ τις ἡμῶς οἶον εἰς μακάρων νήσους τῇ διανοίᾳ κομίσειν: Isocr. 6. 110 εἰ ταῖς διανοίαις ὥσπερ παρεστῶτας ἴδοιτε τοὺς γονίας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας: Polyb. 8. 15. 1 πάλαι δὲ τῇ διανοίᾳ περὶ τὸν Λίσσον καὶ τὸν Ἀκρόλισσον ὦν: Lucian 30 (*Phalaris*). 5 ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δέους νῦν τῷ λογισμῷ γενομένους and again πρὸς ὀλίγον οὖν τῇ γνώμῃ εἰς Ἀκράγαντα παρ' ἐμὲ ἀποσημηνάσαντες.

184 In the fourth line of verse, πρῶτοι δυσμενέων εἶρον ἀμνηχανίην, I cannot but think εἶρον is a mistake for the more forcible and appropriate εἶλον, as I have suggested before that in Tyrtaeus, as quoted by Polybius and Pausanias, εἶρε δὲ (ὁ χρόνος) Μεσσήνης σὺν Διὶ τὸν προδότην, we should read εἶλε. Cf. however Theocr. 10. 17 εἶρε θεὸς τὸν ἀλιτρών, though that is only partially parallel.

218 ἀρκεῖ γάρ μοι μικρὰ καὶ μειζόνων αἰσχρῶς οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ.

There is nothing αἰσχρόν in desiring more than a little. Read γλίσχρως, a much more suitable word and one which is elsewhere confused with αἰσχρός, e.g. Plato *Crito* 53 E, where the MSS. and editors are divided between αἰσχρῶς and γλίσχρως ἐπιθυμῶν ζῆν: Dem. 37. 38. Cf. Cobet, *Collect.* p. 510.

231 εἴ τις τῶν τραγικῶν ποιητῶν τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπεισαγόντων ποιήσειε κ.τ.λ.

The future ἐπεισαζόντων seems almost necessary. I have sometimes thought that in § 6 σώσεται would be better than σφίζεται, as expressing what the early νομοθέτης foresaw; see however Veitch s.v. who says 'we know no instance of fut. mid. σώσεσθαι being passive.'

235 οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἐπέθετο . . πρὶν ἂν μείζον τῶν δικαστηρίων ἰσχύσῃ.

Cobet πρὶν ἰσχύσαι, but in this and similar cases a present meaning easily suggests itself. So e.g. Isaeus 4. 27 οὐτε ἀποδεδήμικασιν οὐδαμῇ πώποτε, ὅποι ἂν μὴ ὑμεῖς προστάξητε.

Letters 1. 4 ἀντιπνεῖ. Probably ἀντέπνει. All the tenses are past.

5. 6 καὶ <αἰ> λοιδορίαί αἷς ἐλοιδορούμην?

10. 1 καὶ ἂ μὲν εἶδον αὐτόθι γράφειν ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ ἀφθονον ἔχειν τὴν ὕλην σιωπήσω. Perhaps <ἄξια> γράφειν.

HYPERIDES.

In *Athen.* 2 οὕτως ὡς ἔοικεν ἐξίστησιν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἔρως προσλαβὼν γυναικὸς ἰαν (the five dots representing the number of letters apparently missing in the papyrus).

Blass cites a number of conjectures, καρδίαν, αἰμυλίαν, κακίαν, ποικιλίαν, πανουργίαν, ἀπιστίαν. Has any one thought of πονηρίαν?

18 ὥσπερ ὑπὸ ἐν ποδοστράβῃ εἰλημμένον.

The missing eight-letter word may be θηρεντοῦ or θηρεντῶν.

21 ὁ ὕστερος πριάμενος ἢ ὁ πάλαι κεκτημένος.

Should not ὕστερος be ὕστερον?

23 καὶ ταῦτα καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς αὐτόν φασιν μέλλειν λέγειν, ἵνα δὴ δοκοῇ μέτριος εἶναι.

If the optative is right, it is another instance of an irregular sequence like Ar. *R.* 24: Dem. 22. 11, in which the speaker's mind changes the time relation. 'His idea was, when he resolved on this,' etc. Cf. particularly Ar. *Av.* 1524 ἐπιστρατεύειν φασ' . . εἰ μὴ παρέξει . . ἵν' εἰσάγοιτο.

31 οἴομενοι δεῖν τοὺς ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις ὑμῖν χρησίμους γενομένους τούτους ἀτυχοῦντας . . φ ὑφ' ὑμῶν.

The conjectures χαρισθῆναι, κομφισθῆναι, ἀντιπαθεῖν, ῥύεσθαι, σωθῆναι are given by Blass, who adds on Kenyon's authority *de lit. φ non vid. dubitari posse*. Has ὠφελεῖσθαι too many letters?

Epitaph. 26 ἐπὶ ὧν ἀπάντων οὔτοι πόνους πόνων διαδόχους ποιούμενοι κ.τ.λ.

This has the appearance of a verse quotation,

πόνους πόνων <δὴ?> διαδόχους ποιούμενοι.

Cf. Eur. *Hec.* 588 λύτῃ . . διάδοχος κακῶν κακοῖς: *Suppl.* 71 ἄγων . . γόων γόοις διάδοχος (quoted in L. and S.).

Fragm. 192 ἐπειδὴν ἐπὶ διετὲς ἦβῶσιν.

The aorist ἦβῶσων, after they have attained manhood, is indispensable.

DINARCHUS.

1. 42 τρία τάλαντα λαβὼν μετέγραφε καὶ μετεσκεύαζε τὸν νόμον καθ' ἐκάστην ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐπῶλει ὧν εἰλήφει τὴν τιμὴν, τὰ δ' ἀποδόμενος οὐκ ἐβεβαίω.

ἐπῶλα seems hardly right. If D. meant 'he offered again for sale what he had

already been paid for,' the *again* and the *already* could hardly fail to be expressed. *ἐπὶ* must, I think, stand for *ἐποίει*, and *οὐκ ἐβεβαίον* (= *οὐκ ἐποίει*) decidedly supports this.

ib. 72 *ἐπιβλέψατε δ' ἐπὶ τὴν Θηβαίων πόλιν*. *ἐγένετο πόλις, ἐγένετο μεγίστη*.

πόλις is unmeaning, but its proposed omission unsatisfactory. Where did it come from? Read rather *πάλαι*, which gives excellent sense. Cf. generally § 75.

ib. 87 *τῇ τοῦτον ἀληθείᾳ <πιστεύουσai>* or something similar?

ib. 110 *εἰς τὸ τῆς πόλεως σῶμ' ἀποβλέψαντες καὶ τὴν πρότερον δόξαν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῇ*.

No parallel is cited for such a use of *σῶμα*. Read *σχῆμα*. Cf. Eur. *Androm.* 1

Ἀσιατίδος γῆς σχῆμα, *Θηβαία πόλις*, where the schol. uses *καλλώπισμα* and *κόμπος*. So *πρόσχημα* in Herod. 5. 28 *Μίλητος, τῆς Ἰωνίας πρόσχημα*. In [Dem.] 61. 12 the MSS. vary between *σώματος* and *σχήματος*: Plut. *Luc.* 8 *σχῆμα* is a certain emendation for *σῶμα*.

2. 9 *ὅτ' εἰς τὸ δεσμοτήριον τὸ πρῶτον ἀπήχθη*. . . , *τοιαῦτα τολμήσαντα ποιεῖν αὐτούς*.

αὐτοῦ Blass with other editors, meaning, I suppose, *there*: but this would be a misuse of *αὐτοῦ* which is not = simple *ἐκεῖ*. *αὐτούς* seems to admit of defence as referring to *τοὺς δεσμώτας* implied in *δεσμοτήριον*. So e.g. Ar. *Eth.* 3. 11. 1118 b 19 *καλοῦνται γαστρίμαργοι, ὡς παρὰ τὸ δέον πληροῦντες αὐτὴν*, and many other passages.

3. 16 Perhaps *καὶ τρίς ἦν ἂν* (for *ῥῶν*) *δικαίως ἐξημωμένος*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

AN EMENDATION OF LUCIAN PHILOPSEUDES 9.

Πάνν γὰρ ιδιώτης, ἔφη ὁ Δεινόμαχος, εἰ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐκ ἐμέλησέ σοι ἐκμαθεῖν ὄντινα τρόπον ὠφελεῖ τοῖς νοσήμασι προσφερόμενα, καὶ μοι δοκεῖς οὐδὲ τὰ προφανέστατα ἂν παραδέξασθαι ταῦτα, τῶν ἐκ περιόδου πυρετῶν τὰς ἀποσπομπὰς καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέξεις καὶ βουβώνων ἰώσεις καὶ τὰλλα ὅποσα καὶ αἱ γῆραι ἦδη ποιοῦσιν. εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνα γίνεσθαι ἅπαντα, τί δὴ ποτε οὐχὶ ταῦτα οἴσησθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ὁμοίων;

The words τῶν ἐρπετῶν τὰς καταθέξεις stand in all the manuscripts, and seem to have passed the editors unsuspected. Apart from the context they contain nothing objectionable. *κατάθεξις*, indeed, I have not found elsewhere; but the form is a legitimate one, and *θέξις* occurs in Plutarch *Qu. Conv.* iv. 3 (p. 662 A) and Aelian *N.A.* viii. 24. *καταθέλω*, *subdue by enchantment*, *charm*, is used of the arts of Circe, κ 213:

τοὺς αὐτὴ κατέθελεν, ἐπεὶ κακὰ φάρμακ' ἔδωκεν.

The verb is rare, however, and hardly occurs in the literature until the beginning of the Christian era. As applied to the physical effect of enchantment I have found it nowhere except in the passage from the *Odyssey*. It is elsewhere used of the charm or seduction exercised upon the human mind by music, eloquence, flattery, pleasant sights, etc. So Lucian *Indoct.* 12 [*Philopatr.* 3], Clem. Rom. *Epit. de Gestis S. Petri* clii. p. 584, Migne, Nic. Paph. *In laud. S. Hyac.*

4, cv. p. 424 Migne, Anast. Sin. *Viae Dux* lxxxix. p. 253 A Migne, Schol. Rav. on Ar. *Eq.* 210 (*θαλφθῇ καταθελχθῇ*). I have been unable to verify the quotation in Stephanus from Chrysipp. ap. Eustrat. 511, 20.¹ This is also the commonest use of the simple *θέλω* from Homer down. It is, however, used of Medea's quieting the dragon in Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* iv. 150 *αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἦδη | οἴμῃ θελγόμενος*, and is also applied to the magical stilling of winds and waters, Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* viii. 7. 28, Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* i. 27. Nicander (*Ther.* 556) uses it of bees attracted by the odour of balm; Longus (ii. 7 *ad fin.*) of cattle charmed by the shepherd's pipe.

As to the facts concerned, that the art of charming snakes was known to the Greeks is adequately proved by two passages in Plato, *Rep.* 358 B, *Θρασύμαχος γάρ μοι φαίνεται . . . ὑπὸ σοῦ ὥσπερ ὄφεις κληθῆναι*, and *Euthyd.* 290 A, *ἡ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐφωδῶν (sc. τέχνη) ἔχεόν τε καὶ φαλαγγίων καὶ σκορπίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θηρίων τε καὶ νόσων κήλησίς ἐστιν*. It may seem a little strange in our Lucian passage that snake-charming should be mentioned as within the powers of mere village witches. But old women are the chosen vessels of occult lore, and popular superstition set no limit to their capabilities.

¹ The verification of several out-of-the-way references was made possible by the kindness of Mr. G. C. Scoggin.

In themselves, then, no fault can be found with the words τῶν ἑρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις. But a careful examination of the context seems to me to throw grave doubt upon the reading. The narrator, Tychiades, has been visiting Eucrates, who is ill with a gouty or rheumatic affection of the feet. In § 7 another visitor, Cleodemus, suggests a marvellous remedy—the tooth of a field-mouse tied up in a lion's skin and wrapped around the legs of the sufferer. Tychiades is skeptical (§ 8), and finally declares that he should have no faith in the remedy, even if sixteen whole field-mice were to be wrapped in the hide of the veritable Nemean lion. He has seen a lion limping, not protected from lameness by the virtues of his own skin! Then follows the speech of Deinomachus quoted above. Here the clause τὰ τοιαῦτα . . . ὅτινα τρόπον ὠφελεῖ τοῖς νοσήμασι προσφερόμενα would lead one to expect in the next clause only allusions to well-known magical cures; and certainly the insertion of a reference to snake-charming between two examples of old wives' medicine seems strange. Furthermore, Deinomachus's last sentence is simply an argument by analogy: if our old women accomplish magical cures, why scoff at Cleodemus's remedy, which operates by like means? But the feasibility of charming serpents is no argument for the efficacy of the remedy suggested.

Again, the reply of Tychiades to Deinomachus takes no account of the mention of snake-charming. Only the second sentence need come into consideration: ἦν γοῦν μὴ πείσῃς πρότερον ἐπάγων τῷ λόγῳ διότι φύσιν ἔχει γίνεσθαι, τοῦ τε πυρετοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἰδήματος δεδοτός ἢ ὄνομα θεσπέσιον ἢ ῥῆσιν βαρβαρικὴν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο [ἐκ τοῦ βουβώνος] δραπετεύοντος, ἔτι σοι γραῶν μῦθοι τὰ λεγόμενά ἐστι. Would not Tychiades have had his fling at the snake-charming, had it been mentioned? § 10 is occupied by some further discussion between the champions of legitimate and magical therapeutics. Finally, the conversation takes a turn in § 11, where Ion tells how a Chaldean magician cured a man who was at the point of death from a viper's bite, and then (§ 12) caps this with a still more marvellous yarn of how the same magician rid a farm of reptiles in a manner that remotely suggests the Pied Piper.

I cannot believe that Lucian introduced into the speech of Deinomachus in § 9 this utterly irrelevant mention of serpent-charming. Two courses, then, remain open: (1) the words τῶν ἑρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις may be regarded as an interpolation, perhaps suggested by the snake-stories in §§ 11 and

12; (2) these words may contain a corruption, and conceal an allusion to the magical healing of some disease. Against the former alternative may be urged the improbability of the rare word *κατάθελξις* being interpolated. We might have expected *κλήσις* (see the passages from Plato quoted above), especially as Lucian uses *κλήω* several times—I have counted ten cases, as against eight of *θέλω* and its derivatives—and *κλήσις* occurs in *De Salt.* 72, not, it is true, in the sense of a physical fascination. Again, I would suggest—though I do so with some hesitation—that while *βουβώνων* *ιάσεις* instead of τῶν βουβώνων τὰς *ιάσεις* is a natural variation in a list of three items, the omission of the article would be hardly so likely to occur if only two diseases had been mentioned.

On the other hand, if the words τῶν ἑρπετῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις contain a corruption, it occurs to me that the right reading might be τῶν ἑρπητῶν τὰς καταθέλξεις, the *allaying* (by a charm) of *herpes*. Of this disease more must be said later. A question may arise as to the use of *κατάθελξις* with reference to the relief or cure of a disease. The word is found only here, and *θέλξις* in Plutarch and Aelian cited above (the only examples in the lexicons) means *charm*, *allurement*, of a pleasant sensation. Of the few examples of *καταθέλω*, as has been explained, only one (κ 213) implies a physical effect resulting from the action of the verb. Yet it seems natural enough that the notion of *bewitch*, *charm*, *beguile*, should pass into *quiet*, *soothe*, *heal*; and when we examine the more frequently occurring *θέλω*, evidence for this transition is not wanting, though it is scanty and has been overlooked by the lexicographers.

The usage of Lucian himself affords no example of *θέλω* in the sense of relieving pain or disease. The nearest approach to it is *De Salt.* 79, where there is a mediate comparison between the soothing influence of the sight of dancing and the effect of an opiate upon a mind tortured by passion. Among other authors especial attention is due to Eur. *Fr.* 725 (Nauck), from Plut. *De Aud.* 16 (p. 46 F): ὡς Εὐριπίδης φησὶ, τὸ Τηλέφῳ τραῦμα

πριστοῖσι λόγχῃς θέλγεται ῥινήμασιν.

Marcellus of Side, a contemporary of Lucian, writing of the σκάρος in his fragmentary *Medicina ex Piscibus*, has the lines (55 f.):

τοῦ δριμύεια χολὴ μέλιτος μέτα φάεα θέλγει,
δὲν σέλας φορέονσα λιπανγέσιν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.

Corroborative evidence may also be found

in the following examples of derivatives from *θέλω*. *Hymn. Hom.* 16. 4 (*ad Aescul.*) the god is called *κακῶν θελκτήρ ὀδυνῶν*. *Eur. Or.* 211, ὦ φίλον ὕπνον θέλγητρον, ἐπικούρου νόσου. *Hippol.* 477 ff.:

νοσοῦσα δ' εὖ πως τὴν νόσον καταστρέφει.
εἰσὶν δ' ἐπ' ὧδαι καὶ λόγοι θελκτῆριον
φανήσεται τι τῆσδε φάρμακον νόσου.

Here the disease is love. *Cf.* also *Aesch. Choeph.* 666 πόνων θελκτῆριος | στρωμνῇ, and *Suppl.* 456 γένοιτο μύθου μῦθος ἂν θελκτῆριος, which L. and S. render *speech that heals speech*. The propinquity of *ιατρός* and *θέλω* in *Pindar Nem.* 4. 2f. is worthy of notice.

The analogy of two verbs of similar meaning, *κλέω* and *πραίνω*, may be regarded as confirming to some extent the application of *θέλω* to the soothing of pain or the healing of diseases. In the passage quoted above from the *Euthydemus*, the enchanter's art is called *θηρίων τε καὶ νόσων κήλησις*. In *Soph. Trach.* 1001 ff. the tortured Heracles cries

τίς γὰρ αἰδοῖς, τίς δ' ἰεροτέχνης
ιατροίας, ὅς τήνδ' ἄτην
χωρὶς Ζηνὸς κατακληλῆσει;

Just before we have *τόδ' ἀκήλητον | μανίας ἄνθος*, where the scholiast has the note *ἀκήλητον ἀνίατον, ἀκαταπραῖντον*. *Cf.* *Aelian N.A.* ii. 24, σοφάτατος . . . κλέειν τε ὀδύνας καὶ ἀφανίζειν. In *Soph. Phil.* 649 f. *Philoctetes* says:

φύλλον τί μοι πάρεστιν, ᾧ μάλιστα ἀεὶ
κομῶ τόδ' ἔλκος, ὥστε πραῖνεν πάνν.

Cf. *Galen xiii.* p. 749 K., τὴν ὀδύνην πρῶτον πραῖνομεν. The interrelations of the verbs *θέλω*, *κλέω*, and *πραίνω*, and their compounds, are shown by the following glosses: *Hesych.* κλεῖν πραῖνει, θέλει. καταθέλογμα· καταπραῖνόμενα, *Suidas*: κατακλούσαν· θέλουσαν, πραῖνουσαν. θέλω, καταθέλω, and κλέω are synonyms in *Lucian Indoct.* 12, where they are applied to the effect of music. *Cf.* also *Aleiph.* ii. 14 (*Schepers'* numbering), where *Meineke's* objection to *κατακληλῆσας* is ill founded.

The name of the disease *ἔρπης* survives in modern medicine, *herpes zoster* being the ailment commonly called *shingles*. The ancients, however, did not restrict the name to the eruptions now called by the generic name of *herpes*. *Hippocrates* speaks of *ἔρπητες ἐσθιόμενοι* (*Aphor.* 5. 22, περὶ ὕγρων χρίσιος 6), which are evidently corroding ulcers (*cf.* *Prorrh.* *Secund.* 13, *Galen ix.* p. 273 K.). Other writers seem to have classed *herpes* and *erysipelas* (*ignis sacer*) together (*Pliny*.

N.H. xxvi. 121, *Celsus v.* 28. 4, *Marcel. Emp.* xi. 29, xx. 12); and *Galen's* discrimination (xi. p. 74f. K.) perhaps points to a confusion in other authorities. The reason for the manifold application of the name *ἔρπης* lies in its meaning, 'the creeping disease.' The ancients did not lose sight of this etymology, a fact which goes far to remove any difficulty that may still be felt with regard to the use of *κατάβελξις*, originally *charming*, in the sense of *allaying, healing*. Certain diseases were viewed in an imagery derived from animal life. *ἔρπης* was also called *ὀφίτης* (*Galen xix.* p. 440 K.). The language used in describing the *φαγέδαινα* in *Eur. Fr.* 790, is such as might be applied to a devouring animal (*cf.* *Aesch. Fr.* 252). *θηρίον* and *θηρίωμα* are terms for malignant ulcers (see L. and S. s.vv.), and it seems possible that this meaning of *θηρίον* may have been felt in addition to its abusive significance in *Dem. Aristog.* 95. *Cf.* also *καρκίνος*, cancer.

One of my objections to the reading *ἐρπετών* might be raised against *ἐρπήτων* also—namely, that the answer of *Tychiades* takes no account of it. To this I should reply that the disregarding of one of three *homogeneous* items in the speech of *Deinomachus* is natural enough; the mention of all three would savour of preciseness. But the failure of the skeptic to notice an allusion to serpent-charming, if it really belongs in the speech of his antagonist, is not so easily explained. Besides it may be that *πυρετός* and *οἶδημα*, the two items mentioned by *Tychiades*, were so symptomatic of some disease classed with, or confused with *ἔρπης*, as to render the express mention of that disease superfluous. Fever and swelling accompany *erysipelas*.

The argument for *ἐρπήτων* would be strengthened, if it could be shown that this disease, like fevers, received special attention from magical practitioners. Direct proof of this is not at hand. There can be no doubt, however, that the *medicina anilis* had its prescription for every fleshly ill. There is a peculiar sentence, perhaps a gloss, in *Pliny N.H.* xxx. 116: *Herpes quoque animal a Graecis vocatur, quo praecipue sanantur quaecumque serpunt*. Of an animal *herpes* we hear nothing elsewhere; but the sentence may be a confused allusion to a sympathetic cure of herpes, or some other 'creeping' disease, by means of a creeping animal. It follows directly upon an account of the medicinal uses of snails. Several astonishing remedies for *ignis sacer*—under which, it should be remembered, *Pliny* and *Celsus*

include *herpes zoster*—are recorded in Pliny *N.H.* xxx. 106. Among them are earth-worms, crickets, a viper's head, a snake's slough. The significance of the choice of creeping things is not to be overlooked. The blood of tortoises was used for anointing *ignis sacer* according to *N.H.* xxxii. 41. Some such remedy, accompanied by an appropriate *ἐπιφθῆ*, may have been meant by Lucian in our passage.

The negroes of the Southern States tell of a cure for shingles that is worthy of any of the superstitious sympathizers who gathered around the bed of Eucrates. The eruption must be rubbed with the blood of a perfectly black cat. If the animal has a single white hair, the treatment will fail.

CAMPBELL BONNER.

Peabody College for Teachers,
Nashville, Tenn.

ON THE USE OF THE ARTICLE WITH ORDINAL NUMERALS IN GREEK.

It is well known that the article is often omitted before the ordinal numeral in Greek, but none of the grammars gives the rule for its omission correctly. For example, Kühner-Gerth, i. § 465, 14 says: 'Ein mit einem Ordinalsworte verbundenes Substantiv kann sowohl ohne als mit dem Artikel stehen, je nachdem der Gegenstand entweder unbestimmt oder bestimmt werden soll.' The instances however show that the article is only omitted when the ordinal is used with words denoting time like *ἔτος*, *ἡμέρα*, *μῆν*, and with these it is almost invariably omitted unless a preposition is inserted. With other words the article is not omitted. The following instances are only from Thucydides, but the usage of other authors is the same. (1) In the following the article is omitted: i. 12 *ἐξηκοστῷ ἔτει*, 18 *δεκάτῳ ἔτει*; ii. 2 *μηνὶ ἔκτῳ*, 47 *πρώτῳ ἔτος*, 103 *τρίτῳ ἔτος*; iii. 25 *τέταρτον ἔτος*, 88 *πέμπτον ἔτος*, 116 *πεντηκοστῷ ἔτει*, *ib.* *ἔκτον ἔτος*; iv. 51 *ἑβδομον ἔτος*, 90 *ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ*, 101 *ἑπτακαίδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, 116 *ὄγδοον ἔτος*; v. 39 *ἐνδέκατον ἔτος*, 51

δωδέκατον ἔτος, 56 *τρίτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος*, 81 *τέταρτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος*, 83 *πέμπτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος*; vi. 4 *ἔτει πέμπτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ*, 7 *ἔκτον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος*, 8 *ἡμέρᾳ πέμπτῃ*, 59 *ἔτει εἰκοστῷ*; vii. 18 *ὄγδοον καὶ δέκατον ἔτος*, 75 *τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*; viii. 6 *ἐνὸς δῖον εἰκοστὸν ἔτος*, 24 *τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, 58 *τρίτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει*, 60 *εἰκοστὸν ἔτος*, 107 *ἡμέρᾳ τετάρτῃ*. (2) In the following the article is inserted: (a) without any apparent difference of meaning from those under (1). ii. 2 *τῷ πέμπτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ ἔτει*, 70 *τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος*; v. 24 *τοῦ ἐνδεκάτου ἔτους*; (b) when a preposition is added: i. 87 *ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει καὶ δεκάτῳ*; vi. 59 *ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ (ἔτει)*; (c) with words other than *ἔτος*, *ἡμέρα*, *μῆν*: ii. 59 *μετὰ τὴν δευτέραν ἐσβολήν*; iv. 31 *τὸ πρῶτον φυλακτήριον*; v. 20 *τῷ πρώτῳ πολέμῳ τῷδε*, 24 *ὁ πρῶτος πόλεμος*, 26 *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ πολέμῳ*, 55 *ὡς τὸ τρίτον μέρος*, 68 *ἡ πρώτη τάξις*; vi. 44 *ἡ πρώτη παρασκευή*; viii. 17 *ἡ πρὸς βασιλείᾳ ἐνυμαχία ἡ πρώτη*.

JOHN THOMPSON.

NOTE ON HORACE, *ODES* III. iv. 9, 10.

Me fabulosae Volture in Apulo
Nutricis extra limen Apuliae.

Such is the reading of most MSS., the only important variant among the older ones being the *limina Pullie* of the Berne MS. and Paris A¹. It is of course impossible that it can be right. Horace would not have used the same word at the end of two successive lines with different quantity, even supposing that he would have repeated the word at all. Of the various suggestions—*limina*

Pulliae, *limina sedulae*, *limina patriae*, *limina Dauniae*, etc., etc., I have always preferred *Dauniae*, the conjecture of Paldamus, adopted by Ritter in his edition, on the theory that *Apuliae* was a gloss to explain *Dauniae*, which it finally ousted, and so forced the change to *limen*, *metri gratia*. It was not, however, until I chanced to be reading the first and third books of the *Odes* simultaneously with two different classes that the reading became a certainty in my own mind. Take the familiar I. xxii.

Integer vitae scelerisque purus
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu
nec venenatis grvida sagittis,

Fusce, pharetra,
sive per Syrtis iter aestuosas
sive facturus per inhospitalem
Caucasum vel quae loca *fabulosus*
lambit Hydaspes.

namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
terminum curis vagor expeditis,

fugit inermem,
quale portentum neque militaris
Daunias latis alit aesculetis
nec Iubae tellus generat leonum
arida *nutrix*.

pone me pigris ubi nulla campis
arbor aestiva recreatur aura,
quod latus mundi nebulae malusque

Iuppiter urget;
pone sub curru nimium propinqui
solis in terra domibus negata:
dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo,
dulce loquentem.

Here we have a situation very similar to that in the seven stanzas III. iv. 9-36—a mock-heroic portent, and an assurance of safety in the most dangerous and distant quarters, in I. xxii. to the upright man, and in III. iv. to the friend of the Muses. A wolf is said always to fly from a grown man in broad daylight, and a small child, tired out with play, would not be prevented from falling asleep by the fear of bears or vipers. But the point to which I wish to draw attention is the occurrence of three striking words in this poem, *fabulosus*, I. 7; *Daunias*, I. 14;

nutrix,¹ I. 16. These, if the suggestion *Dauniae* is right, are all collected in the two lines that are the subject of this note. Such imitations by Horace of himself are of course familiar to everyone: this one may be worth special note, as (in my view at least) it settles a disputed reading.² Perhaps I may be allowed to quote another instance of an imitation in the third book of the first, but in this case Horace has expanded one line in Book I. into three in Book III.

Odes I. xviii. 5. Quis *post vina* gravem
militiam aut *pauperiem* crepat?

Cp. III. xxi. 18-20.

viresque et addis cornua *pauperi*
*post te*³ neque iratos trementi
regum apices neque *militum arma*.

I have noticed many similar instances in Vergil: I might quote here *Aeneid* vii. 250-1.

talibus Ilionei dictis *defixa* Latinus
obutu tenet ora, soloque immobilis haeret.

and compare *Aen.* i. 495.

dum stupet *obutuque* haeret *defixus* in uno,
where three salient words are collected
consecutively into one line.

G. M. HIRST.

Columbia University.

¹ Note that this incidentally supports *nutricis*, III. iv. 10, as against the variant *altricis*.

² If the parallelism between the two odes is to be pressed, *Syrtis* in I. xxii. 5 should be taken of the sea and not of the sandy coast that borders it; otherwise there is nothing to balance *navita* etc. in III. iv. 30.

³ sc. *pia testa*.

ON TWO PASSAGES OF THE PANEGYRICUS MESSALLAE.

THERE seems to be some fatality about the punctuation of the first lines of this piece, which Mr. Némethy in his just published edition would have to be the work of Propertius. I thought my recent text of Tibullus in the Oxford Series had escaped, but I observe with consternation that this is not so.

The true connexion of verses 3-7 was first pointed out by Scaliger, though in 3 he read *at* for the correct *ac* of the Cujacian Fragment, and the whole passage may be subjected to modern punctuation as follows:

Te, Messalla, canam quamquam tua cognita
uirtus

terret: ut infirmæ nequeant subsistere uires,

NO. CLXXXIX. VOL. XX.

incipiam tamen, ac, meritas si carmina laudes
deficient, humilis tantis sim conditor actis
nec tua praeter te chartis intexere quisquam
facta queat, dictis ut non maiora supersint,
est nobis uoluisse satis.

The argument is in substance this: I will sing your praises, Messalla, although I am deterred by my consciousness of your eminence. My strength may prove unequal to the task (*ut concessive*), but still I will take it in hand, and if my poem fall short of your merits and I prove a composer that cannot rise to the level of your achievements, no one but yourself being able so to chronicle your exploits as not to leave over greater deeds than he has celebrated, the wish will

be enough for me. The *si* of v. 3 covers all the verbs down to *queat* (upon which *super-* depends), and its apodosis is *est-satis*.

The sense of the whole passage as well as the construction of lines 2-3 may be illustrated from Ovid *Pont.* III. iv. 79 '*ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda uoluntas.*'

70 sqq.

illum inter geminae nantem confinia mortis
nec Scyllae saevo conterruit impetus ore
cum canibus rabidas inter fera serperet
undas e.q.s.

That l. 71 can be construed is probably the reason why up till now it has never, to my knowledge, been suspected. For all that, *saevo* (*seuo* in the tradition) seems to be a corruption of *seno*. The six swooping heads of Scylla, each making prize of a man, are the most notable feature of the description in the *Odyssey*, 12. 90 (cf. 100) and 246; the next most notable one is Odysseus' vain intrepidity (*nec—conterruit*), ib. 228 *ἀνὰρ ἐγὼ καταδὺς κλυτὰ τεύχεα καὶ δύο δοῦρε μάκρ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔλῶν κ.τ.ε.* And our author would appear to have combined the two.

J. P. POSTGATE.

ON THREE PASSAGES OF THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.

II. i. 229

insontes animas nec portitor arcet
nec durae comes ille ferae.

It must be conceded to Mr. Housman (*C.R.* 1906, p. 42) and to Mr. Slater (*Journal of Philology* xxx. p. 159) that line 230 is corrupt. Mr. Housman proposes *serae* for *ferae*, with inattention to the meaning of *comes*. Bars do not go with dogs or anything else, and when Cerberus went for a run, he left this 'companion' behind: Prop. iv. 7. 90 '*errat et abiecta Cerberus ipse sera*' quoted by Mr. Housman. Mr. Slater proposes *prompsisse* for *comes ille* to be construed with *arcet*. ('I bid thee come) for stainless souls neither Charon nor the stern fiends forbid us to have forth' (the italics are his). He has somehow persuaded himself that if *se promere* can be used of people letting themselves out of a wooden horse *Aen.* ii. 260 *promere* may equally well be used of 'us' getting a spirit out of Hades. Far easier is it to conjecture that here, as so often in the *Silvae*, the trouble began with a wrong division of words and that *comes ille* has come from *coma s(a)eva*, the snaky fell of Cerberus: Ov. *Her.* ix. 94 '*Cerberos implicitis angue minante comis.*' *saeua* is properly applied to a 'custos' (cf. Tib. i. 2. 5). *durae* should no doubt be *dirae* 5. In *ille* we have another example of the stupid botching of which I have given numerous illustrations in my *Silvula, Philologus*, 1905, pp. 132 sq.

II. vii. 100

sic et tu, rabidi nefas tyranni,
iussus praecipitem subire Lethen.

This is the punctuation that appears in the Corpus text, while the ordinary one (Klotz, Phillimore) is: (rabidi nefas tyranni!). The Corpus has no note here and the deviation may accordingly be thought capricious; but it is not. It was suggested by the passage in the *Pharsalia*, of which this contains a reminiscence, viii. 549 '*si meruit tam claro nomine Magnus | Caesaris esse nefas.*' The words are to be taken in apposition to *tu iussus*.

IV. iv. 69.

nos facta aliena canendo
uergimur in senium: propriis tu pulcher in
armis
ipse canenda geres paruoque exempla parabis.
magna Getae, dignos quem iam nunc belliger
actus
poscit auos praestatque domi nouisse triumphos.

So the Matritensis and the Teubner text of Klotz. But *auus* is reported from the excerpts of Politian, and Herr Vollmer, ignorant that Statian employs the ancient form in -os which persisted into the Flavian era (see *C.R.* xvii. 350; cf. Lindsay *Journal of Philology*, xxix. p. 32, Housman on Juvenal, vi. O 13, p. 50), adopts the corruption. Mommsen, in his paper on Victorius Marcellus, the subject of this poem (*Hermes* xiii. 429), had by an oversight referred *auus* to Marcellus' father. And the commentator on Statius follows in his wake, innocently remarking '*belliger* von Kriegsthaten des Vectius M. wissen wir nichts,' and being thus unable to understand *praestat* alters it with Peyraredus to

perstat. Marcellus' father was indeed a nobody, but his son had married into the family of the Hosidii Getae; and thus young Geta could be addressed (75) as

stemmate materno felix, uirtute paterna.

The *auos* then is the boy's maternal grandfather and may be identified with the Cn. Hosidius Geta whose successes in Mauretania are recorded by Dio Cassius (60. 9) and whose gallantry in Britain (A.D. 43) gained him the *ornamenta triumphalia*, ὥστε καὶ τιμὰς ἐπινικίων, καίπερ οὐχ ὑπατευκώς, λαβεῖν (*ib.* 20). He was consul (suffectus) with L. Vagellius at the close of 45 or 46,

C.I.L. x. 1401. In 95 when this poem was written he would have reached a very advanced age; but in all probability he was dead. This also suits the language of the poet better: *poscit* is more impressive if the claim comes from the dead. The construction *praestat nouisse* appears to be on the pattern of 'dat habere,' 'tradam portare,' etc.; but *praestat* may govern *nouisse* directly.¹

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ Mr. Phillimore gives *qui* for *quem* in 72, and in 73

poscit avo spernitque domi novisse triumphos.
What improvement this is I cannot see.

NOTES.

AD LUCIANI ΛΟΓΙΚΟΝ Η ΟΝΟΝ C. 34.

Luciani Λόγ. ἡ' Ον. c. 34 p. 603 (Equarum pastor, cuius tutelae Lucius asinus fuerat traditus, ceterumque servitium, nuntiata dominorum morte fugam capessere statuunt, raptimque copiis agrestibus in dorso iumentorum congestis facessunt, magno quidem Lucii dolore propter sarcinarum pondus, maiore tamen gaudio quod virilitatis iacturam effugerit, quam ob nimiam ferocitatem ei comminati erant pastores): 'ὁ δὲ νομὲὺς τῶν ἵππων καμὲ παραλαβὼν καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα δυνατὸς ἦν συλλαβὼν ἐπεκατέδησέ μοι καὶ ταῖς ἵπποις***. ἐγὼ δὲ ἡχθόμεν μὲν φέρων φορτίον ὄνου ἀληθινού, ἀλλ' οὖν ἄσμενος τὸ ἐμπόδιον τοῦτο τῆς ἐμῆς ἐδεξάμην ἐκτομῆς.'

Iniuria Dindorf et Iacobitz lacunam statuerunt; non enim deest aliquid sed abundat; quippe corrigendum est:

'ὁ δὲ νομὲὺς τῶν ἵππων καμὲ παραλαβὼν [καὶ] πάνθ' ὅσα δυνατὸς ἦν e.q.s.' i.e. 'pastor equarum qui me in tutelam receperat e.q.s.'; spectant haec ad c. 27 'καλέσας οὖν (sc. ὁ δεσπότης) τῶν ἵπποφορβῶν τινα τοῦτ' με παραδίδωσιν.' Eandem rem, quamquam fusius, ut fere solet, enarrat Apuleius *Mel.* viii. c. 15 p. 174 12 v. d. Vliet: 'sed equorum magister qui me curandum magna ille quidem <cum> cura suscepit, quidquid in casula pretiosum conditumque servabat, meo atque aliorum iumentorum dorso repositum asportans sedes pristinas deserit. gerebamus infantulos et mulieres e.q.s.—nec me pondus

sarcinae quamquam enormis urgebat, quippe gaudiali fuga detestabilem illum exectorem virilitatis meae relinquentem.'

Rotterdam.

A. J. KRONENBERG.

* * *

'MOTH AND RUST'—A CLASSICAL IMAGE.

θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὐτε σὴς οὐτε βρῶσις ἀφαιρίσει.—Matth. vi. 20.

It appears that none of the commentators on these words has cited from Greek poetry a passage so similar in thought and expression that the parallel can hardly be fortuitous. It is from Pindar, *Frg.* 222 (243) (ascribed, it is true, by the *Schol.* ad Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 407, to Sappho, but quoted on Hesiod *Opp.* 430 by Proclus, on the authority of Plutarch, with greater probability from Pindar) and runs thus:—

Διὸς παῖς ὁ χρυσός·
κένον οὐ σὴς οὐδὲ κίς δάπτει.

Surely, if these words, or something like them, were current throughout Greek-speaking lands in the first century as a proverb, the passage from the Gospel by an allusion to them gains much in force and beauty.

W. T. L.

REVIEWS.

BLAYDES' SOPHOCLES ANTIGONE.

Sophoclis Antigone: denuo recensuit et brevi annotatione critica instruxit FREDERICUS H. M. BLAYDES, M.A., OXON. Halis Saxonum: 1905. Pp. 104. Price M. 2.

It is nearly half a century ago since Dr. Blaydes issued the first instalment of his edition of Sophocles; this instalment contained the *Trilogy*. During the interval that has elapsed since 1859, he has completed the *Sophocles*, issued an edition of *Aristophanes* in some dozen or more volumes; has published *Adversaria* upon most of the Greek classical authors, as well as an edition of the *Aeschylean Trilogy*; and now, in extreme old age, has girded himself to the task of re-editing the *Sophoclean Trilogy*. Of that edition—which is almost wholly 'critical'—two parts are already out; the third, containing the '*Antigone*', is before us. The Nestor of English philologists has not laid his pen aside even yet; on the cover of the book now under notice we observe the announcement:

SUB PRELO: ANALECTA COMICA GRAECA.

It is, indeed, a wonderful record of work achieved; and we must all heartily congratulate Dr. Blaydes on the services he has rendered to the cause of Classical philology. If this scholar's work is less known in England than it ought to be, he cannot complain of any lack of attention in Holland and Germany.

The present work exhibits all Dr. Blaydes's virtues, and vices, as a commentator. There is the same wealth of conjecture, the same maddening iteration, the same tantalizing incompleteness in the survey of the critical field. Despite all that Jebb has done for Sophocles, in our generation, Dr. Blaydes takes singularly little account of his work (except, possibly, in the '*Addenda*').

Let me take one or two examples of what is implied in the above animadversion.

In the *Antigone* there are two instances where the older scholia give a sure clue to a reading otherwise lost. The first is l. 40, the second l. 235. As regards the former passage (where the MSS give *θάπτονσα*), Blaydes reads as follows:

κλαίονσ' ἂν ἡ θάπτονσα προσθείην πλέον. . .

that is, he disregards the apparently certain reading (suggested by the Schol.) *ῥάπτονσα*, adopts (in his text) Haakma's *κλαίονσ' ἂν* (for *λύονσ' ἂν*: Heath *κλύονσ' ἂν*), and changes *προσθείμην* into *προσθείην*.

In 126 Blaydes keeps the genitives *ἀντιπάλων* . . . *δράκοντος* (abandoning his old conjecture *δυσχείρωτα*), but makes no mention of the conjecture proposed, and adopted, by Jebb.

Coming to line 130—a well-known crux—Blaydes, adhering to his old suggestion *Καπανῆ* (for *καναχῆς*), suggests, without the slightest warrant, *μεστόν* for *χρυσού*. Thus:—

μεστόν Καπανῆ' ὑπερόπτας :

giving, as his reason, that the participle *ὀρμώντα* is sufficient indication that a proper name is required. But this is to re-write one's author, not to edit—much less explain—him. In l. 149 *ἀντιχαρείσα* (though excellently supported by Jebb) is branded as 'vitiosum,' and *ἄρτι χαρείσα* adopted in the text, though in the crit. n. *ἄλκαρ ἔχονσα* is put forward as a suggestion.

No passage is likely to test the literary sense of a commentator more exactly than the highly impassioned lines 593–602. Roughly speaking, Jebb, in his text, departs some three times from the MSS; Blaydes seven or eight times. Yet a glance at his critical notes shows that he is by no means satisfied with the text he adopts. This is how his text runs:

ἀρχαῖα τὰ Λαβδακιδῶν δόμων ὀρώμαι
πῆματ' ἄλλ' ἄλλοις ἐπὶ πῆμασι πίπτοντ',
οὐδ' ἀπαλλάσσει γενεὰν γένος, ἀλλ' ἐρείπει
θεῶν τις, οὐδ' ἔχει λύσιν.
νῦν γὰρ ἐσχάτας ἀπὸ
ρίζας ὃ τέτατο θάλος ἐν Οἰδίπου δόμοις
κατ' αὐτὴν φοινία θεῶν τῶν
νερετέρων ἀμᾶ κοπίς
λόγον τ' ἀνοῖα καὶ φρεσὶν Ἑρινύς.

The following are the changes that are proposed (in the *crit. nn.*):—for *δόμων* he conjectures *σκοπῶν*; *ὀρώμαι* is stigmatized as 'suspectum'; instead of Dindorf's *ἄλλ' ἄλλοις* he proposes *ἀφθόως*; for *γένος*, *ἄγος*; for *ἔχει λύσιν*, *ἔστιν λύσις*; for *ὃ τέτατο*, *ἐτέτατο* (this

conj. was orig. made by Hermann); for *φάος*, *θάλος* (though it is admitted that *τέτατο φάος* finds good support in *Philoct.* 831); for *φρενῶν*, *θεῶν*.

But this is not all. On referring to the *addenda* (Dr. Blaydes seems unable to dispense with the inevitable 'addenda'), we find the following note:

'Quamvis longe aptius de *φάει* quam de *θάλει* diceretur *τέτατο*, vix dubitari potest quin vera lectio hic sit *θάλει* (et *κοπῆς*).'

One turns, with some interest, to lines 23-25, by way of seeing how this passage fares in Dr. Blaydes's hands. This is how the passage appears:

'Ετεοκλέα μὲν, ὡς λέγουσ', ὑπὸ χθονὸς
ἐκρυψε, τοῖς ἐνερθεν ἐντιμον νεκροῖς.

In other words, the editor has conflated three lines into two, and has arbitrarily changed *κατά* into *ὑπὸ*, remarking (in the

addenda) 'melius aberit versus *futilis interpolatus*.'

In the opening lines of the play, what is the editor's attitude towards the *locus vexatus* *ἄτης ἄτερ*? Admitting that the words offend, he reads (from his own conjecture, made in 1859)

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐτ' ἀτηρὸν οὐτ'
ἄτιμον κ.τ.λ.

but makes no mention of his alternative conjecture (also published in 1859) *ἀτηφόρον*, one of the best yet proposed (see Jebb's note).

That this edition contains much valuable matter, will not be denied; but, of the many dozens of conjectures Dr. Blaydes put forward, a very scant percentage is likely to find favour with future editors. The book is rich in its collection of parallel passages; and herein, perhaps, lies its chief claim upon the attention of scholars.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

King's School, Ely.

GOODWIN'S *MIDIAS* AND *DE CORONA* OF DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenes against Midias. With Critical and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix by WILLIAM WATSON GOODWIN. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1906. Demy 8vo. Pp. viii + 188. 9s.

It is matter for mutual congratulation amongst lovers of Greek literature that Prof. Goodwin is devoting his energies to editing Demosthenes. Except the speeches undertaken by Dr. Sandys separately or in conjunction with the late Prof. Paley, an English student is reduced to read his Demosthenes in the main with the assistance of antiquated commentaries or such knowledge as he himself possesses. It is true that such independent study breeds a sturdy judgment and individual appreciation of the orator; but there is much to-day, ascertained and demonstrated past question, which a young student cannot easily fall in the way of, and in consequence, either wastes time in impossible conjectures of his author's meanings or sees darkly what he might have seen clearly.

To begin with, Prof. Goodwin gives us a text deduced from the manuscript tradition by the rigidly scientific methods now understood to be alone legitimate or fruitful.

Then he gives a sufficient commentary on difficulties,—obscurities, negligences, allusions—bringing in the evidence of new discoveries like Aristotle's *Ἀθ. πολ.* and inscriptions to elucidate his text; and lastly, deliberately excluding from his notes such comments as too many other editors supply—as he says, 'using the oration to teach Greek syntax,'—he throws what little he allows himself of such writing into an Appendix.

I have already said that Prof. Goodwin can be relied upon to give a generally sound text. In a few places only are his conclusions debatable. In § 55⁴ the reading of E (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*) seems at least arguable, if *αὐτῶν* = *τῶν μαγτειῶν*. In § 85⁷ *ἀποφύρειν* of Σ might be supported by § 86⁶ *ἀνόμετος ἀπηνέχθη*. In § 99⁴ (quoted below) I see no reason for rejecting *προσῆκεν* on the single authority of A. In § 129⁵⁻⁶ *φοβοῦμαι . . μὴ . . τοιοῦτός τις ὑμῖν λογισμὸς ἐμπέσῃ* 'τί οὖν; σὺ δεινότερ' ἢ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς ἕκαστος πεπονθὼς ἀγανακτεῖς;' the argument seems to me to require *σὺ <οὐδὲν> δεινότερ' ἢ κ.τ.λ.* The previous section says 'had Midias injured me only, I should have been afraid that he would escape punishment by pointing to his general good behaviour.' Then in § 129 we

have 'as it is, his conduct has been so bad to many others that I fear, when you hear how others have suffered, you will think that I am no worse treated than the rest.' A more serious difficulty presents itself in § 154⁸⁻¹⁰ where Σ, P, Y, O have *ὅτε σύνδυν' ἦμεν οἱ τριήραρχοι καὶ τὰναλώματα πάντ' ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων οἰκῶν* (the editor by a misprint has *οἰκῶν*) καὶ τὰς ναὺς ἐπληροῦμεθ' αὐτοί. A has *ἰδίων ἑδανῶμεν*, F *ἰδ. οἰκ. ἑδαν.* Prof. Goodwin after Schaefer reads *διωκοῦμεν*, which may be right and must give the right sense. The Scholion, *σύμπαντα οἰκοῦσθαι οἱ τριη. παρέχον* suggests to the editor *οἰκοῦσθαι παρέχον* for *ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων οἰκῶν*. I should doubt if he can really intend the third person—which seems an impossible construction; but I would suggest *ἔχομεν* as the original reading, and I believe that the converse confusion of ΕΙΧ with ΟΙΚ is the source of the perplexing *μετείχον* in Thuc. ii. 16 § 1, where *μετώκουν* would be another turn for the following *τὰς μεταναστάσεις ἐποιοῦντο*.

Another textual correction removes the last obstacle to accepting what Prof. Goodwin rightly decides to be the true date of Demosthenes' birth. In § 154 Demosthenes declares, according to the present text, *δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη γέγονα*. Since the speech, as there is good reason for thinking, was written in 349 B.C., and the evidence is strong for 384 B.C. as the year of Demosthenes' birth, some explanation is needed. I have no doubt that ΔΔΔΠ should be read for ΔΔΔΙΙ, a suggestion supported amongst other evidence by the figures given at the end of so many speeches recording the number of lines in the Alexandrian MS. from which these copies are derived.

Perhaps, however, the most difficult sentence textually is the long and perhaps inchoate period, if it be a period, which fills §§ 215, 216. In this the common text has introduced order by inserting a *μόν* and *δέ* absent from Σ, A, P, Y, O, thus producing a sentence of this general form: *νῦν δὲ τοῦτο . . . ἂν δεινότατον συμβαίη εἰ παρ' αὐτὰ <μὲν> τὰδικήμαθ' οὕτως ὀργίλως . . . ἔχοντες ἐφαίνεσθε (Σ has φαίνεσθε) ὥστε . . . ἰβόατε καὶ ἀνεκράγετε . . . καὶ μετὰ ταῦτ' ἀπαντῶντες . . . τοιαῦτα λέγοντες· ἐπειδὴ <δέ> κεχειροτόνηται μὲν ὕβρις τὸ πρᾶγμ' εἶναι . . . τῆνικαὐτ' ἀποψήφισθε ὑμεῖς*. Prof. Goodwin rightly ejects these particles, and then wishes to eject also *φαίνεσθε*. It would seem wiser to treat the sentence as regular enough down to *λέγοντες*, to mark there with a dash an anacoluthon and put a question mark after *ὑμεῖς*. Perhaps *φαίνεσθε* even may be defensible if *ἔχοντες* be

regarded as imperfect. But conversely in 202⁶ *ἐὰν μὲν τι τῶν δεόντων ἀπαγγελθῇ τῇ πόλει . . . οὐδαμοῦ πρόποτε Μειδίας τῶν συνηδομένων . . . ἐξητάσθη τῷ δήμῳ, ἂν δέ τι φλαῖρον . . . πρῶτος ἀνέστηκεν εὐθὺς καὶ δημηγορεῖ*, where the editor translates 'those who sympathized with the people,' I should like to ask consideration for the view that *ἐξητάσθη*, though with *οὐδαμοῦ πρόποτε*, is a gnomic aorist (Prof. Goodwin himself on § 190³ *οὐδὲν ἐν ὑμῖν πρόπος' εἶπον . . . ἀλλ' ἔγνωσεν ὅτι ἂν συμφέρειν ὑμῖν ἡγῶμαι* calls attention to the close kinship of these uses of the aorist). The form of the protasis and the parallelism of the sentence to my mind make this more natural. And if this be accepted, *τῶν συνηδομένων* will be 'those who (as a rule) sympathize,' i.e. the popular party.

These, however, are minor matters, on which doubtless opinion will remain divided: the general effect of the text is that the reader will follow his author with lively pleasure, and whenever he is tempted to turn aside and examine the textual evidence is gratified to find on how firm a basis it rests.

As regards the editor's interpretations, there are naturally more pronouncements which seem to another mind questionable. In the well-known passage about the arbitrator Straton there can be no doubt that Professor Goodwin has misunderstood some part at any rate of the text.¹

Briefly to indicate where the editor seems to stumble, I may say that in § 85⁵⁻⁶ *τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον οἷός τ' ἦν πείθειν αὐτὸν . . . καὶ πενήκοντα δραχμὰς εἰδίδον ὥς δ' ἔδυσχέρανον οὗτοι τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ οὐδετέρους ἐπέειθεν, ἀπειλίσσας . . . τί ποιεῖ*; does not mean 'he was at first successful in his attempt to persuade' but 'first, he was capable of soliciting them and offered them a bribe: when this failed, what next?' In § 83⁶ *ἔπερ (τὸν ταλαίπωρον ἀπολώλεκεν)* is better referred to Straton's honesty (*πάνν χρηστός* just before) than to the remoter *γίνεται μοι διαιτητής*. As to 'the arbiters' last day' (§ 86⁶) the editor has seen farther than his predecessors when he says 'we cannot suppose that Athens was left without public arbiters for even a few weeks at the end of each year.' But when he interprets 'the last day' to be 'the last appointed for hearing complaints against individual arbiters,' and thinks

¹ On § 84 (*οὗτος διαιτῶν ἡμῖν ὁ Στράτων . . . τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐπισχεῖν ἐδίδό μου τὴν διαίταν . . . τὸ τελευταῖον δ' . . . κατεβίησεν*) by an oversight which is most unfortunate in so difficult a passage, we have 'In this view, our passage means, that after all legal devices had been tried in vain . . . Midias appealed to Demosthenes to suspend the arbitration indefinitely.' Midias should, of course, be Straton.

'this might come in either of the last two months of the year,' he makes the reader ask 'Was Athens left then without this process against unjust arbiters for some weeks at the end of each year?' And this distrust of the proposed interpretation is strengthened by observing the strange sense given to the words (§ 87) *καθάπαξ ἄτιμος γέγονε καὶ οὔτε λαχεῖν ἀδικηθέντα οὔτε διαιτητὴν γενέσθαι* *Μειδία οὐθ' ὅλως τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν βαδίζων, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐστ' ἀσφαλές*, which, it is said, 'implies that Straton, if he had not become ἄτιμος, might have acted as arbiter after the time here mentioned.' It would be as proper to infer that, if he had not become ἄτιμος, he might have walked the same street as Midias. Yet this is given as an argument to bear out the contention that 'it cannot be the last day of their term of office, which would always be the last day of the year.'¹

In § 99³⁻⁵ *ἀλλ' ἴστε δῆπου ὅτι τοὺς ἀδίκους τι πᾶσχοντας ὃ μὴ δυνήσονται φέρειν ἐλεῖν προσήκει, οὐ τοὺς ὧν πεποιήκασι δεινῶν δίκην δίδοντας*, what is to me a difficulty is unnoticed by Prof. Goodwin. How are we to understand *φέρειν*? Presumably it is 'to put up with,' 'submit to' (for which cf. §§ 143¹⁰, 150⁴, 197¹⁰). In § 124¹⁻⁴ too, where we have *οὐ δὲ δὴ δέ παρορᾶν τὰ τοιαῦτα, οἷδε τὸν ἐξεύργοντα . . . τὸ δίκην . . . λαμβάνειν . . . ἄλλο τι χρὴ νομίζειν ποιεῖν ἢ τὰς τῆς ἰσηγορίας καὶ τὰς τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἡμῶν μετουσίας ἀφαιρέσθαι*, I should have liked a note, warning the reader that ἡμῶν should not be taken with *μετουσίας*, but with *ἀφαιρέσθαι*. Besides being in harmony with the Attic rule, this is supported by the subsequent *ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ ἴσως δεισσοσάμην . . . οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τί ποιήσετε κ.τ.λ.* (a question by the way not answered, as the editor declares, in § 125¹).

In one respect I venture to think the editor betrays an intellectual deficiency which interferes with his duty to his author. He seems occasionally to betray a regrettable absence of the oratorical instinct. This leads, to take one example, in § 147⁷⁻⁹ to a curious misapprehension of the sense. The text runs *τοὺς Ἑρμαῖς (Ἀλκιβιάδης) περιέκοπεν. ἅπαντα μὲν, οἶμαι, τάσεβήματα τῆς αὐτῆς ὀργῆς δίκαιον ἄξιον. τὸ δ' ὅλως ἀφανίζειν ἱερὰ ἐστ' ὅτι τοῦ κόπτειν τοὺς Ἑρμαῖς διαφέρει*. The editor writes, 'a strange comparison between the total destruction of sacred ornaments and the mere mutilation of the Hermae.' Demosthenes passionately, but naturally enough, styles Midias' actions 'an entire abolition of

public worship, the sweeping away of all religious rites at one stroke.' So the Scholia quoted by Prof. Goodwin understood it: 'ἱερὰ μόνον ἢ ἀρχαῖα (ancient text, whereas later MSS. read *ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα*) ἔχει, ἐμφαντικῇ οὖσα πολλῶν, οἷον στεφάνων, ἐσθῆτος, αὐτῆς τῆς ἐν ἱερῷ πανηγύρεως. The same deficiency is the source of an unimportant error in a note on § 106⁶, *εἰ γὰρ ἐν ὧν ἐπεβούλευσε κατάρθωσεν, ἀπάντων ἂν ἀπεστερήμην ἐγὼ καὶ μηδὲ ταφῆναι προσυπῆρχεν οἴκοι μοι*. It is as unpleasant as explaining a joke to have to point out here that the orator is, in an exaggerated and heightened sentence, roundly declaring of each and all Midias' schemes what is true only of one. But the editor writes *ἐν ὧν ἐπ.* 'is the one of his schemes which was designed to convict Dem. of murder.' Similarly, in the notes on 87¹⁻² *παρὰ πάντας τοὺς νόμους* and *κλητῆρ'* Demosthenes' representation of the facts is, I think, too fully accepted as exact; but it would require considerable space to discuss this properly.

But these are slight blemishes: the book is generally sound, sensible, and illuminating. Besides explaining most difficulties in a way that finally disposes of them, Prof. Goodwin gives us valuable information as to the Demosthenic uses of words. In the case of one indeed his editing of the *De Corona* first has perverted his judgment. In that speech Demosthenes twice uses *δημοτικός* for 'a friend of the people,' with some reference to Aeschines iii. 168-170, and in the *Midias* Prof. Goodwin would give it the same sense. But in neither of the *Midias* passages will this view bear examination. In § 183⁵ *ἐὰν μὲν τῶν μετρίων τινὰ καὶ δημοτικῶν* is opposed to *ἐὰν δὲ πλούσιος ὢν τις* and in § 209² *ἡμῶν τῶν πολλῶν καὶ δημοτικῶν ἀνθρώπων* is opposed to *οὔτοι (πλούσιοι καὶ τριήραρχοι) μετὰ Μειδίου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων τούτῳ*. There can be little doubt that here the word means 'one of the common people.'

Of misprints there are very few. I have noted: § 177⁵ (note) *ἔχθρ'* for *ἐχέθ'*, § 39⁶ (note) *τοῖς νόμοις* (wrong fount), § 186⁶ crit. note *εἰκὺς* for *εἰκός*, *λῆξις κλήρον* (for *κλήρου*) § 78¹ (note), *οἶκαν* above mentioned, § 154⁹, in § 161¹ note 365 for 355 B.C., § 79⁵ an accent dropped on *κάκ'* and in § 170¹ note *τῆ*, § 130⁴ *εἶθ'* wrongly accentuated, § 226¹ note *τὸθ' ἑατρον*, § 215⁷ note *ὡς* (should be *ῶστε*), § 201⁴ *ἐγὼ* and § 200² where *τίς* most unfortunately receives an accent.

A note that *τιμὴ* is used in modern Greek for price is twice repeated §§ 49⁴, 149⁸. In § 146⁵⁻⁶ *ὅτι οὖν ἀκοντες παθεῖν κάλλιον εἶναι νομίζοντες ἢ ἐκόντες ὑβρίζεσθαι*

¹ The Editor points out to me that the source of the mistake is that the subject of *λαχεῖν* has been taken to be Straton.

συγχωρήσαι, the case of ἄκοντες deserves a note as much as § 17⁶ αὐτὸς συγκροτεῖν ὥστε δέιν (a cross-reference to which should be given on § 143⁴ where the same syntax is used). Further, to conclude with one or two other matters on which for myself I should have been glad of Prof. Goodwin's plain statement or opinion, are οἶμαι and οἴμαι used haphazard and interchangeably? or is οἶμαι reserved for the last place in a sentence as in § 80² where Σ, Α have it, while other MSS. have οἴμαι? In § 1³ at the end of a sentence οἶμαι is in most MSS., οἴμαι with ο above the line in Σ, and uncorrected in F. But in § 220⁸ ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἴμαι. And how are εἵνεκα and εἰνεκα distinguished? In § 56⁵ we have ἐτάξατε. τίνος εἵνεκα; ὅπως κ.τ.λ.—a sufficiency of short syllables (Α has εἰνεκα): in § 8² τῶν ἰδίων τινὸς εἵνεκα γίγνεσθαι on the evidence of P, Υ only: in § 227⁸ πάντων οὖν εἵνεκα τῶν εἰρημένων supported by Σ, P, Υ, O. And lastly the uses of ἐπί might be re-examined with profit: § 21¹ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων is masculine surely, not neuter, cf. §§ 183¹¹, 225³; in § 66⁴ ἐφ' ἅπασιν reads to me more like the same use as § 126⁵ οὐκ ἔσθ' ἐφ' ὅτῳ τῶν πεπραγμένων ἐγὼ μόνος ἠδίκημαι, than as the editor says 'on every pretext.'

I cannot lay down my pen without adding that I have seldom enjoyed any edition of a classical masterpiece so much as I have this edition of the *Midias*.

Demosthenes on the Crown. Edited by WILLIAM WATSON GOODWIN. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1904. Pp. viii + 296. Crown 8vo. 6s.

THIRTY-FIVE years ago Mr. Arthur Holmes published his edition of the *De Corona* in the *Catena Classicorum*. Generations of schoolboys and undergraduates have put its serviceableness to the test, and found it not wanting. Prof. Goodwin has now prepared what 'is chiefly an abridgement of the large edition of Demosthenes on the Crown' which was published by him in 1901. He has produced a book exactly commensurate with the needs of such students as would formerly have turned to Holmes' book. The practical experience of a Sixth Form finds expression in the verdict that all difficulties which present themselves to a student's mind are dealt with by the editor, and that there is never any room for doubt as to the way in which he explains them or interprets a passage. This is no small praise, and should give the book an indefeasible title

to its consideration and use by classical teachers. It is indeed characterized, generally, by the same excellences as I have already noted in the same editor's *Midias*.

The very different character of the two speeches naturally leads Prof. Goodwin to adopt a somewhat different method of treatment. For the *De Corona* we are given an invaluable Historical Sketch of fifty pages, which furnishes the reader with the facts, necessarily to be known, if he would appreciate the relevance of the various arguments used and the justice of the interpretation given by the orator to the several events discussed. It is first in the tone of this Sketch and the political judgments it contains that Prof. Goodwin will probably be thought, at least in this country, to be not wholly commendable. He strikes the keynote of his comments in his Preface.

'I have made no attempt to be neutral on the question of the patriotism and the statesmanship of Demosthenes in his policy of uncompromising resistance to Philip. It seems to me that the time for such neutrality is past That the policy of resistance to Philip's aggressions failed at last is no discredit to the patriotism or the statesmanship of Demosthenes.'

The patriotism of Demosthenes, his strenuous loyalty to the high traditions of the past, the value of his example, and the inspiration of his ideals,—these none would deny; but when Prof. Goodwin calls us to admire the statesmanship of the orator, he is on debatable, if not untrustworthy, ground. Without going the length of contending that the very defeat of Demosthenes' policy proves that it was mischievously miscalculated, we may fairly insist that it is reasonable before commending it unreservedly to review it from other standpoints than of an Athenian partizan. If Caesar's cause was blessed by Heaven, it was blessed no less by the provincials: and, if a handful of Roman citizens were worth more than a multitude of provincials, yet for generations unborn the Imperial government was justified by the event as better than a republic, even from the highest and noblest point of view. The humanizing of the remoter districts in Greece made intercommunication more easy; and, as history shows, this inevitably brings in its train the possibility of forming larger aggregates of men, and therewith the subjugation, in the struggle for existence, of all communities which obstinately cling to their old narrower and more insular patriotisms. It is true that something is lost by their extinction; but it requires the uninformed prejudice of a Shelley to exaggerate the loss till it overtops the

gain. Could Demosthenes have won the petty units of Periclean Greece to merge themselves in a wider entity, a league or United States, he might have defeated Philip's alternative policy: but it would not have been the Athens of the past that would have thus escaped from the Macedonian's clutches, but a new municipalised town differing less widely from what Philopoemen and Cicero and St. Paul knew than from the impossible ideal of Demosthenes' fancy. To say this is not to exalt Aeschines into a superior of his rival; but it would in my judgment have been an enormous service to those who are likely to use this book if Prof. Goodwin had dissociated the policy of Demosthenes from his patriotism, and had found himself able while contrasting Demosthenes favourably with Aeschines to draw the moral, that naturally suggests itself today, from the failure of the smaller organisms to retain their individuality as soon as a larger organism is evolved.

However, this is a question which will doubtless be decided largely by personal predilections. There are a few points of interpretation on which the editor's views do not compel instantaneous assent. In § 107⁵ οὐ τοῖνυν μόνον τῷ μὴ καθυφείναι ταῦτα σεμνύνομαι οὐδὲ τῷ γραφεῖς ἀποφυγεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ συμφέροντα θέναι τὸν νόμον καὶ τῷ πείραν ἔργῳ δέδωκέναι the note runs 'on the law having given a test of itself (sc. τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ).' The old view given by Holmes seems in every way preferable that the subject is still 'I.' The sense then is 'I have given you an opportunity—in the study of the working of my law—of testing the worth of my political views,—my honesty and patriotism.'

In § 130 in spite of all the editors the argument seems to shew that the alternative reading recorded by Σ needs consideration. According to that reading after οὐκ ἀπορῶν δ' ὅτι χρὴ περὶ σοῦ καὶ τῶν σὼν εἰπεῖν, ἀπορῶ τοῦ πρώτου μνησθῶ, which is followed by a series of insulting questions, Demosthenes proceeds ἀλλὰ νῦν τὸν Δία καὶ θεοὺς ὀκνῶ μὴ περὶ σοῦ τὰ προσήκοντα λέγων αὐτὸς οὐ προσήκοντας ἔμαντῶ δόξω προηρῆσθαι λόγους. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὧν ἔτυχεν ἦν, ἀλλ' οἷς ὁ δῆμος καταρᾶται. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παραλείψω, ἀπ' αὐτῶν δ' ὧν αὐτὸς βεβίωκεν ἄρξομαι. ὁψέ γάρ . . . αἱ 'Αθηναῖος καὶ ῥήτωρ γέγονεν. This seems logical; to place ταῦτα μὲν . . . ἄρξομαι before οὐδὲ γὰρ spoils the orderly development of thought. The parents are first abused, and then Aeschines' own life is stigmatized, beginning with his alleged assumption of citizenship and fabrication of a respectable ancestry. Apart from this textual question the editor

misses the point of οἷς ὁ δῆμος καταρᾶται. A reference to lix §§ 88-91 will show that amongst the ways of 'deceiving the people' one is named¹ which has a special bearing on our passage. It was 'deception' to misrepresent the facts of birth and lineage, so as to foist a man into the citizen roll. This makes me—though with considerable hesitation—ask whether ὧν ἔτυχεν can really be the same as τῶν τυχόντων 'ordinary parents' with the following words παρὰ προσδοκίαν for τῶν πολὺ διενεγκόντων. Is it not more to the point to translate 'he was (really) the son of the parents whom he got² (or picked up)'—i.e. whose names he made use of for the purpose of making pretensions to the franchise? The whole sentence thus acquires a precision which vastly improves it as an oratorical effort.

In the familiar passage (§ 169) describing the reception of the news that Elateia had fallen, τὰ γέρρα is taken by Prof. Goodwin to be the wickerwork with which the booths were covered. He refers to Harpocration, but does not state that that writer expressly pronounces for this view,³ rejecting the sense of 'barriers enclosing the ἐκκλησία'. The coincidence of the word with the article being found in lix § 90 (τοὺς πρυτάνεις κελεῖν τιθέναι τοὺς καδίσκους ὁ νόμος καὶ τὴν ψῆφον δίδόναι προσίόντι τῷ δήμῳ, πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσιέναι καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν) makes it seem likely, as Abbott and Matheson suggest, that the same sense, whatever it is, attaches to the words in both places. These editors quote also a Scholiast on Aristoph. *Ach.* 22 (τὸ σχοινίον φεύγουσι τὸ μεμλτωμένον).

ἀνεπετάνυσαν γὰρ τὰ γέρρα καὶ ἀπέκλειον τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς μὴ φερούσας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰ ὄνια ἀνήρουν ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ὅπως μὴ περὶ ταῦτα διατρίβουεν. The coincidence with Harpocration is noteworthy and that writer's further comments on the κατὰ Νεαίρας passage deserve to be cited: ἦτοι οὖν ταῦτόν ἐστι τῷ ὑπὲρ Κτησιφῶντος ἡ τοιοῦτό τι ὑποληπτέον ὡς παρὰ τοῖς ἐκκλησιάζουσι πολῖταις ἡ ψῆφος ὑπὸ τῶν πρυτάνων ἐδίδετο πρὶν εἰσιέναι τοὺς ξένους καὶ πρὶν ἀναρεθῆναι τὰ περιφράγματα, τουτέστι πρὶν ἀναπετασθῆναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παντὶ τῷ

¹ Notice especially καὶ ἥδη τισὶ τοῦ δήμου δόντος τὴν δωρεάν (sc. τοῦ 'Αθηναίου γενέσθαι), λόγῳ ἐξαπατηθέντος ὑπὸ τῶν αἰτούντων (§ 91).

² No hesitation need be felt over the occurrence in prose of *τυχάνω* with the genitive—Aeschines (who must have used a not very different style) has i § 156 πλείστων καὶ σωφρονεστάτων *τυχόντας* ἐραστών.

³ τὰ τῶν σκηνῶν σκεπάσματα καὶ παρακαλύμματα ἐμπιπρασθαί φησιν ὁ Δημοσθένης ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ συνεστάναι περὶ τὰ ὄνια ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς μηδὲ πρὸς ἄλλοις τισὶ τὰς διατρίβας ἔχειν.

εἰπεῖν βουλομένη. In the absence of further evidence, it is reasonable to take γέρρα as in the *De Corona*, and to suppose that these were 'cleared away' and a passage 'opened up' through them before at any rate important assemblies. No doubt Prof. Goodwin is right in supposing that the fire was a signal to the outlying demes that they should come in for the next day's meeting.

Of smaller matters may be mentioned that τὰ ἀδύνατα in § 108 will be, as Abbott and Matheson say, 'cases of incapacity' more aptly than, as our editor, 'cases of impossibility': in § 256 ψυχρότητα, which he translates (with L. and S.) 'want of feeling,' and

which Abbott and Matheson better translate 'bad taste,' is perhaps nearly 'impertinence' in the parliamentary sense: and p. 80 notes col. 1 line 8 is the one misprint I have noticed (τοῦ).

In conclusion I ought to state that seven useful essays are added to the book, on e.g. the γραφή παρανόμων, the Constitution of the Amphictyonic Council, the Hero Physician and the Hero Καλαμίτης, and the Manuscripts of the Oration on the Crown. The student will find that armed with this edition he is virtually αὐτάρκης.

T. NICKLIN.

SHARPLEY'S HERODAS.

A Realist of the Aegean. Being a Verse-Translation of The Mimes of Herodas. By H. SHARPLEY. London: David Nutt, 1906. 7" x 5". Pp. x + 57. 2s. 6d.

MR. SHARPLEY is already favourably known for his edition of Aristophanes *Pax* (see *C.R.* xix. 447). The present volume is more slender than its predecessor in more senses than one. But it proves that Mr. Sharpley is possessed of skill as a translator; and it ought to have the effect of introducing Herodas (it is satisfactory to see this author's name thus spelt) to readers who have not studied him in the original. This little book forms an acceptable addition to the translations of the Classics which are being rapidly issued at the present time, and which, let us hope, find purchasers.

Mr. Sharpley can claim that his is the first translation of the Mimes of Herodas into English. His aim is thus described (Preface pp. v, vi): 'The translator has endeavoured to keep closely to the Greek, and to avoid modern associations which were not justified by the original. No decipherable passages have been omitted, although certain phrases in the second Mime have been compressed or softened.' Furthermore 'it should be added that the use of the word "belt" in the sixth Mime [i.e. for βαυβών] is euphemistic' (*ib.* p. vi). This aim the translator has, on the whole, satisfactorily accomplished. The metre which he has chosen is the rhyming couplet: not, indeed, an exact representative of the scazon, but it is scarcely possible to imitate in English the peculiar halting movement of

that line. The 'weak' and 'feminine' endings (to borrow phrases from Shakesperian studies) help to give to the version the necessary tinge of colloquialism. The following is a specimen (p. 57 = Herodas vii 53 sqq.).

'Pistos, bring out the lot,
Yes, every case. Ah, ladies, you must not
Take home with you a single coin you've
got.
Now you'll see all these various kinds:—
Ionian,
Ambracian, Argive, Chian, Sicynian,
Yellow shoes, red shoes, hemp shoes, low
shoes, high shoes,
Parrot shoes, crab shoes, chick shoes, ankle-
tie shoes,
With striplings, sandals, buskins, midnight-
trippers,
And every kind of boots and shoes and
slippers.
Tell me your hearts' desire: the cobbler's
trade is
(When not devoured by dogs) devoured by
ladies.'

The modern associations of which Mr. Sharpley speaks may be traced on p. 7 (= i 78)

'You "care for none
Of these things," as they say:'

though it is rather beside the point to make Gullis into a female Gallio: and on p. 11 (= ii 44 sq.)

'His "last suit of clo'es
And what's beneath them."'

The version in this last passage is somewhat too far from the original.

The following line is inelegant in point of scansion

'At her age, to keep one, let alone two'

(p. 11 = iii 39): and on p. 27 (= iv 66 *sqq.*) we have

The ox, the man in charge, the girl
Who walks beside, the beaked shock-headed
churl,
Aren't they just animals?

This last word is not very complimentary to the artist in its implication: the original is *οὐχὶ ζῶν βλέπονσιν ἡμέρην πάντες*;

Mr. Sharpley says (Preface *ib.*): 'the readings adopted, where they differ from Mr. Nairn's text, have been tabulated in the Appendix, and the writer hopes to have an early opportunity of discussing some of these elsewhere.' When this opportunity is offered it will be interesting to see Mr. Sharpley's

reasons for deserting the indications of the MS., e.g. at iii 11, vii 8, 24, 85, 96. At vii 24 in particular the reading *ἄλλα πάντα καλλίστως* may be safely pronounced impossible after Dr. Kenyon's article in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* i 384 (referred to in my note *ad loc.*).

Finally Mr. Sharpley speaks (in terms for which recognition is hereby rendered) of the writer of this notice as the author of the only complete English commentary. He obviously disbelieves in the existence of an edition which is mentioned at the end of the article by Dr. W. G. Headlam in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* vol. xxix (tenth edition) s.v. Herodas.¹ Or perhaps we may say that he tacitly relegates it to 'the land where mice eat iron easily' (p. 19 = iii 76).

J. ARBUTHNOT NAIRN.

¹ See Preface to Translation, p. v (note). Dr. Headlam's words are 'There is a complete edition, with commentary and translation, by the writer of this article:' i.e. himself.

RECENT TRANSLATIONS OF THE *RUDENS*.

1. *Scenes from the Rudens of Plautus*, translated by members of the Classical Society of the University of Manchester, and adapted for acting and edited by R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D. Second edition. (Sherratt and Hughes, Manchester 1906.)
2. *The Rudens of Plautus*, adapted for representation at St. Peter's College, Radley, with a verse translation and introduction by L. J. AMES. (Parker, Oxford 1904.)
3. *Plautus' Rudens*, translated into English from the text of E. A. Sonnenschein by C. H. PRICHARD, M.A. (E. Johnson, Cambridge 1905.)
4. *Plautus' Rudens* with translation, prepared for performance at the McGill University, Canada.

The *Rudens* seems to have achieved considerable popularity as an acting play. I have before me four editions, three of which have been prepared for school or college performances. Such productions must command the sympathy of all classical scholars at the present day; and I heartily endorse what the Manchester editor says in his intro-

ductory note:—'If the venture helps in any degree to remind students (and others) that Latin is something more than a "dead language," an entertaining exercise will have served a timely purpose.' With the help of these editions the play might be performed either in Latin or in English.

Of the present translations two are in verse and two in prose. All of them have their merits. Both of the former (unlike the 18th century translation by Bonnell Thornton) make a laudable attempt to employ English metres which correspond to the metres of the original. For senarii they rightly employ the so-called decasyllabic verse of English; in the lyrical passages they use metres which correspond in length of line, if not in rhythmical character, to those of the Cantica. Thus in lines 185 ff. the Manchester edition begins

'Men may talk of human woes, but there's nobody
who knows, | how bitter sorrow is till it's their
own;
For the great god of the sea has made a castaway
of me, | shiv'ring helpless in a strange land all
alone.'

(I have ventured to indicate a division of these long lines into two.) The metre of the

original is the *Versus Reizianus*.¹ Here the Radley edition employs 'common metre':—

'How far more bitter human ills
To suffer than to hear!
E'en so with me, since heaven wills
That shipwrecked I should be.'

Again, in lines 906 ff. the Manchester edition begins in one of Macaulay's metres:—

'Now praise be to my patron, Lord Neptune
praised be he,
Who dwells in fishy places in the salt, salt sea!
Home he's brought me from his quarters
With my boat all safe and sound;
And upon the stormy waters
Such a treasure I have found;
The richest, rarest haul it is that ere he sent to
me!'

The Radley edition has:—

'To Neptune, protector of me, I give praise,
Who dwells in the briny and fish-haunted waves;
He back from his precincts, well laden with
store,
A glorious catch, brings my smack safe ashore,
And midst the rough breakers a-swirling and
swishing,
Has blessed me and given rare luck to my
fishing.'

Neither of these metres reproduces the bacchiacs of the original, but both of them offer a pleasant variety from the ordinary metre of dialogue. Trochaic septenarii are reproduced (ll. 557 ff.) as follows:—

'Heaven help us, what's the matter? In the
temple here I've found
Two poor things in floods of weeping, clasping
Venus' statue round.
Someone's coming they're afraid of. Only yester-
night, they say,
They were all at sea and ship-wrecked, now
they're cast ashore to-day.'

Manchester version.

'What's the meaning of it, two young women
weeping at the shrine,
Holding fast to Venus' statue? Lord knows
what it is they dread.
All last night they say they drifted tossing, and
to-day, they say,
They are ship-wrecked.'

Radley version.

The Manchester verses have decidedly more 'lilt'; some of the best seem to me those of 'W. S.' ll. 258–289. On the other hand, the Radley edition contains nearly the

whole play together with a charming Introduction, whereas the Manchester one gives only select scenes. I feel inclined to regret the omission from it of the amusing passage 977–1003. There would be room in most school or college performances for the inclusion of this and also the more elevated passage 1227–1264, which has been translated into Greek by Macaulay.²

The iambic septenarius is represented in the Manchester version by decasyllables (ll. 331 ff.), in that of Radley by the English 'common metre' (same passage), by Alexandrines in ll. 290–305, and by the iamb. septen. itself in 1281 ff. This last is a difficult metre to handle: its effect depends, it seems to me, on (1) maintaining the diaeresis, which divides it practically into two lines, (2) observing the long quantity of the last syllable but one, which is properly trimoric. The Radley verses fail in both respects. Contrast the much better lines of Hookham-Frere, who, however disparagingly he spoke of the metre, knew how to write it: e.g. *Knights* 333 f.—

Unbroken by the rules of art, untamed by edu-
cation,
Show forth the native impudence and vigour of
the nation.

Or take Burns' verses *To John Taylor*, where we have the same metre written as two lines and punctuated by rhyme:—

With Pegasus upon a day
Apollo weary flying,
Through frosty hills the journey lay,
On foot the way was plying.

Or Thomas Moore's *Shamrock* song:—

Through Erin's Isle,
To sport awhile,
As Love and Valour wander'd,
With Wit, the sprite,
Whose quiver bright
A thousand arrows squander'd,
Where'er they pass
A triple grass
Shoots up, with dew-drops streaming,
As softly green
As emerald seen
Through purest crystal gleaming.

² 'The whole performance does not occupy more than an hour.—In order to make the selection as useful as possible the publishers are prepared to print a special cover, at a charge of five shillings, to contain the name of the college, the date of the performance, and the cast, for any college which purchases fifty or more copies. Special arrangements could be made for the addition of further details. It is thought that many students would value the volume not only for its own sake, but as a memento of their student days.' (*Circular notice of the publishers.*)

¹ Not bacchiac, as suggested in the note on page 11; for, among other points, Plautine bacchiacs do not admit of four short syllables in succession.—The text of this, as of the other three versions, is in the main from my edition; but occasionally new suggestions are made, e.g. l. 927 *ut iam liberum te del populo prator*, l. 933, *conclauerit* (for *erit clara*; but *conclaresco* is an unknown compound). The short marks on *nobis* 279, *Veneris* 560, *hic* 568, are misleading.

Mr. Prichard's prose version may be fitly compared with that of the M^cGill acting edition. The latter is far more spirited—indeed it reaches a high level of literary excellence; but sometimes Mr. Prichard attains a higher standard of plain correctness. Contrast the following passages, in which the superiority lies with M^cGill: l. 21 'He keeps the good entered upon other records' (P), 'The good he keeps entered on another list' (M); l. 88. 'It has flooded us with light and increased our windows' (P), 'It has made the house better lighted than ever, with the windows it has put in' (M), ll. 535 f. 'Would that I were enjoying the condition of a duck (!), so as to be dry directly I have got out of the water' (P), 'Would that I were a d-d-d-duck, so that when I came out of the water I should be as d-d-d-dry as ever' (M); l. 871 'What you have got, enjoy' (P), 'Well, you've made your bed and you must lie on it' (M); l. 907 'who dwells in his

briny home surrounded by fish' (P), 'tenant of the salt and fishy deep' (M). The following are passages where the merit of accuracy belongs to Mr. Prichard: l. 865 (*sumne ibi?*) 'I'm here?' (M), 'Am not I on the spot?' (P), l. 1006 'TR. I am mad enough. GR. And I stark mad, but not so mad as to let go this wallet' (M), 'TR. I am choleric. GR. I am hare-brained; still I will not let go of this trunk for all you say' (P); l. 1038 'Never in the world will he give it against his own man to-day, even for a farthing' (M), 'He will never deprive his own slave of a three-obol piece by his decision this day' (P); l. 1087 'you should have gold for gold' (M), 'well, gold shall be bought with gold' (P): it is only the 'shall' that is superior in the latter. In l. 1215, where the M^cGill version misrepresents the sense, and in l. 1243 (a difficult passage) Mr. Prichard is more correct.

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

PHILLIMORE'S *SILVAE OF STATIUS*.

P. Papini Stati Silvae recognovit brevis adnotatione critica instruxit IOANNES S. PHILLIMORE. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. Pp. xxiv + text (not paged). No date. Published 1905. 3s. 6d. cloth.

WHEN we turn the pages of this volume our first emotion is surprise that it should be the work of the editor of the Oxford text of Propertius. That text and its preface suggested the image of a furry animal, at repose on a mat of Berlin wool and gently purring content in front of a fire which the Marthas of Propertian criticism had made up by emptying on it again the dust and *débris* of centuries. This one, the same creature wide awake, alert on its feet and with an eye for dark places.¹

Professor Phillimore is not unaware of this change of attitude, but he charges it to the difference in material. Propertius being an inspired poet can only be revived by inspiration, *canonem regulamque refugit*: Statius being but a mass of rhetorical artifice may be artificially restored. This chameleone-

¹ Professor Phillimore will forgive the metaphor when he remembers that it is merely intended to match his own of the "wild cat" school of English humanists, out-Baehrensing Baehrens when Baehrens had been disavowed by the mass of Continental critics" (*Classical Review*, 1902, p. 472).

like defence will not placate the protagonists of the cause which the editor has for the nonce deserted. They will press an argument, which they and all can feel, that the close agreement of the Laurentian MS. in which *Silvae* II. vii. has fortunately been preserved, with the tradition attested by the Matritensis carries the text as we have it back to a period some two centuries at least earlier than the copying of the 'worshipped Neapolitanus.' They will further urge that as the *Silvae* avowedly consists of fugitive or *soi-disant* impromptu compositions, the same finish cannot be expected from them as from more laboured efforts. To the former criticism the Oxford editor of Propertius must find an answer himself: the latter I will help him to meet. The *festinatio* and *celeritas* of composition upon which our author dwells so much is little better than a sham. The epithalamium of book I. (277 lines in all) was composed in two days. No great feat this, if Lucilius could turn out 200 verses in an hour or if, to come to our own times, an undergraduate with a fluent muse can produce 60 metrical and intelligible hexameters in three hours. Statius' work did not improve by the *longus limae labor*, as all who have toiled through the Thebaid can bear me witness; and if he did not revise his

vers d'occasion before he published, his was a more than human fortitude.

To begin with the *Praefatio*. The relation of the Madrid MS. to the lost 'Vetus Codex' of Poggio and the relation of both to the Excerpts of Politian are questions which no editor of the *Siluae* can hope to escape. Their intricacy is great—much greater in fact than their practical importance—and it has been aggravated by the confusion of thought or expression which every writer who has discussed them has introduced into his discussion. This confusion I have done my best to disentangle three years ago,¹ in an article in this Journal, which I should assume to be wholly unknown to Mr. Phillimore, but for a reference to some opinions embodied in it on p. xvi of his preface. Loth as I am to repeat myself, I must again briefly set the matter in its proper light.

About the year 1418 Poggio sent into Italy a MS. of the *Siluae*. In some year not prior to 1475 nor subsequent to 1494 Angelo Poliziano, we are told, came upon the MS. of the *Siluae* which Poggio had brought into Italy and entered readings from it in a copy of the *editio princeps* now in the Corsini Library at Rome. These readings, published in extenso by Dr. R. Engelmann at the end of a dissertation noticed in *C.R.* 1902, pp. 421 sq., show a most remarkable agreement with the readings of the Madrid MS., which it is admitted is either the actual MS. of Poggio or a most faithful copy of the same. If this agreement were complete, there would be nothing worth disputing about. But among some minor discrepancies there is in the Matritensis a whole line I. iv. 86 b. (not in Mr. Phillimore's text) which Politian says was not in the Vetus Poggii. Accordingly one side, including Dr. Engelmann, Mr. Phillimore and others, say the Matritensis is here interpolated, and the other side, including Dr. Klotz, Dr. Krohn and others, say that Politian is not to be believed. In the article cited I maintained with Dr. Engelmann that Politian was to be believed and with Dr. Klotz that the Matritensis was not interpolated.

The line and its context stand as follows in M.

Libyci quid mira tributi
obsequia et missum media de pace tributum
laudem et opes tantas nec qui mandauerat
ausus
expectare fuit gaudet Thrasymennus et
alpes (86a)

² *C.R.* xvii. pp. 344 sqq.

attollam cantu gaudet Thrasymennus et
alpes (86b)
Cannensesque animae etc.

Mr. Phillimore's line of attack is a singular one. The verse he would have it has come from a gloss on *laudem*. Why *laudem* should have acquired a gloss is explained as follows. Cut off the head of the sentence by omitting *Libyci quid* and its tail by dividing after *opes tantas*, and 'anybody' will take *laudem* to be an accusative singular.

mihi quidem sic videtur: cuius ea verba propone
mira tributi
obsequia et missum media de pace triumphum
laudem et opes (*Silu.* I. iv. 86a).
prima quod aiunt fronte atque obtutu vocem
laudem pro substantivo habebit.

Mr. Phillimore's fancy is not exhausted by this effort but proceeds at once to another. Which of all the possible explanations and synonyms of *laudem* shall we suppose was the first to occur to our gloss maker? Why the half hexameter *attollam cantu*! He winds up by insulting (no milder word meets the case) the memory of Poggio by suggesting that this gloss might emanate from him:

ceterum certe non prorsus indocti hominis est
glossa neque ipso Poggio indigna.

No unprejudiced reader would however for a moment think of considering *attollam cantu* as a gloss or indeed as anything but the beginning of a verse. In this regard *attollam* with *cantu* is a very proper and indeed a Statian expression, e.g. *Silu.* V. iii. 10 sq. 'magnanimum qui facta attollere regum | ibam altum spirans martemque aequare canendo.'

And when all is said and done this fiction of a gloss is of no use to Mr. Phillimore, for it is reconcilable with no one of his theories as to the relation of the Excerpts and the Matritensis. He holds with Prof. Wachsmuth that the Vetus Poggii excerpted by Politian is the original MS. discovered by Poggio and brought by him into Italy, not the copy which his 'most ignorant scribe' made for him on the spot and which he sent to Barbaro. This is a perfectly tenable hypothesis, and one moreover which is strongly supported by the fact, on which Mr. Phillimore lays a very proper stress, that Politian in referring to the lacuna at *Silu.* V. v. 24-26 says 'codex vetustus itercisus h't hos versus' in place of using *desunt* or *desunt* which are employed for omissions elsewhere, e.g. V. v. 76 (*Praef.* xv), words

that indicate a mutilation of an exemplar rather than a lacuna in a copy.

For the Matritensis he offers three alternative origins :

(1) It is the copy of the Vetus Poggii sent to Barbaro.

(2) It is a copy of this copy made by Barbaro.

(3) It is a copy of this copy made by Niccoli.

It cannot be (1) because, according to Mr. Phillimore, the two words *attollam cantu* were not in the Vetus and were added as a gloss in the copy that is either in the margin or between the lines. But in the Matritensis the whole line stands in the text. It cannot be either (2) or (3) because it is inconceivable that either a 'homo doctus' such as Poggio asked Barbaro to employ (p. vii) or any Italian selected by Niccoli would have been so incapable as to copy a marginal or interlinear gloss and fill the line up by a nonsensical repetition of a part of the previous verse.

Mr. Phillimore turns every stone to convict the unhappy *attollam cantu* of irrelevance :

cuius vero ludibri est Statio τὸ *attollam cantu* imputare ! non enim omnino de cantu agitur cum familiare sit colloquium inter Apollinem Aesculapiumque (p. xiv. n.).

The argument is inconclusive. Apollo and Aesculapius are but shadows : the real singer is Statius himself. An ancient reader would have understood this at once. Had I time, I could develop this point ; but let it suffice to refer to an observation from the praefatio to my separate text of Propertius p. vii. on Prop. III. xi. 35 sqq. (vv. 50, 62). 'Similis sed paulo intricatior ratio in IV. i. 135 sqq. uatem enim loquentem inducit Propertius, uates Apollinem ita tamen ut Sexti ipsius dictata uterque reddat.'¹

Mr. Phillimore's assault on the view first maintained by Dr. Klotz (Teubner ed. p. lxxii) that this line was in the old MS. which Poggio discovered and that thence it was faithfully copied into the Matritensis must then be pronounced to be a failure. That this line has produced a dittography *gaudet Thrasymennus et alpes* which has bereft us of the end of the preceding one is no

ground for dubbing it spurious. In such an accident there is nothing to surprise us, as others have pointed out and as we need not go beyond the first book of Lucretius (1022, 1023) to perceive. What the words lost were it is naturally impossible to tell. But I see no reason to surrender my proposal *laudatis imparefactis*. For Statius to say that his verses were unequal to the deeds that he celebrated is an intelligible and in the circumstances a not extravagant compliment : it agrees well with the turn of *Silu.* V. iii. 10 sq. (already quoted to defend the first half of the line), '*facta attollere—martem aequare canendo*,' and in addition it would account for the slipping of the copyist's eye which produced the dittography owing to the similarity of the letters *laudat-* and *gaudet*.

The old dilemma now recurs. The line was in the Poggian MS. from which the Matritensis was copied ; but it was not in the Poggian MS. which Politian excerpted. What is to be done ? ταῦτα τρίς τετράκις τ' ἀμπολεῖν ἀπορία τελέθει. So I will simply refer to *C.R.* l. c. p. 349, where the solution which occurred to me, and, independently, to Mr. G. A. Davies, my colleague in the Corpus text,² is given.

I leave the relations of the MSS. and pass on to Mr. Phillimore's construction of his text. He most rightly holds that both the Matritensis and the excerpts should be used for the restoration of the poet's words. The readings of the former he takes from the collations of Klotz (Krohn) and Souter. For the Excerpts he depends upon the statements of Dr. Engelmann, which are based on the Heidelberg photographs, though in one place he says 'colus . . . mihi visus eram dispicere in A' (I. iv. 64).

When I reviewed Dr. Engelmann's dissertation in the *Classical Review*, I knew of no reason for doubting his strenuous asseverations of the accuracy of his reports. But

² Let me here protest against the assigning of this text to me alone, as is done by Mr. Phillimore ('editio—Postgatiana,' p. xxi) and Mr. Slater (*Journal of Philology*, xxx. p. 144). It is fair neither to Mr. Davies nor to myself. The character of the joint editorship is clearly set forth in the preface to the fourth part of the *Corpus*, p. xi. It is joint in the sense that both of us contributed to the text, not in the sense that either singly is responsible for a particular reading in it.

I would at the same time with the aid of Mr. Phillimore's apparatus correct some wrong ascriptions of conjectures which escaped us. I. ii. 183 the punctuation is Herr Helm's (1900) ; iv. 85 *quantas* Markland ; II. iii. 69 *quo* Baehrens (on this see below) ; IV. ii. 6 *dominamque dedit contingere mensam* Waller ; ib. 83 *uisus* (an early emender, see below) ; V. iii. 269 *Heinsius*, teste Mr. Housman (*C.R.* Feb. 1906, p. 47), conjectured a lacuna here.

¹ In n. 2 on p. xiii. we read 'Klotz, Vollmer, Krohn lacunam a semet ipsis factam omnimodis caementis atque sordibus explere certant.' The first part of this sentence begs the question and the second part, which is an echo of Dr. Engelmann, is irrelevant, as I have already shown (*C.R.* l. c. p. 348). 'He must apply himself to a supplement which Statius might have written, not to those which could by no possibility be his.'

since then I have obtained a copy of the first page, and I regret to say that after a careful examination of it with the help of more than one friend, including two of the most eminent of our palaeographers, I find that he makes statements respecting readings which he calls *A*,¹ that is to say lections supposed to be in the handwriting of Politian and to represent excerpts taken from the ancient codex of Poggio, for which no sufficient warrant is provided by the photograph.

Line 10. *n. h.e. enim n. o. . . . A al. man. ad o addidit portet huius.* The words said to be added are not visible in the photograph.

23 *Ceterū* | *Cētū A*, not visible in the photograph.

33 *gloriare & uillam* | *gloriari uillam A*, not traceable in the photograph.

Were the question merely one of the right assignment of readings, it would be needless to pursue it further. But sometimes the discrepancy between '*A*' and *M* is of importance, e.g. I. iii. 26 '*fluuiū ne obstare A*,' '*fluuiorum optare*' *M.* *ib.* 41 '*tuta*' *A* Phillimore, '*tota*' *M.* The photographs ought clearly to be published or at least a copy of them obtained by the British Museum or some other public library for the use of scholars in this country.

An exact estimate of Mr. Phillimore's text involves much adding and subtracting. But we may say in general that in his treatment of the *Siluae* he pursues at any rate a sound critical method, and pursues it in the main with a good deal of judgment and acuteness. His conjectures, of which there are however too many (for example, some forty in the first book alone, and fourteen in the text), are usually addressed to real difficulties, and not unfrequently help towards. His errors are largely due to the haste of which this volume betrays more than one sign—but in part to insufficient knowledge and neglect of necessary research.

I. i. 6 *effigere M.* Of Mr. Phillimore's two suggestions *exegere* (text) is less probable than *effecere* (note).

ib. 20 *tardo M. tantum* (text) is a needless alteration. *nec tardo* means 'et non-tardo' = that is 'ueloci.'

ii. 13 *cestuque* (text, *coetuque M*) *Latino.* The note refers to Lactantius ad Theb. ii. 283 showing that Venus uses the 'cestus'

¹ *A* is to be carefully distinguished from *A**. These are readings which are safeguarded by a note from Politian that they are taken from the Vetus, and to them the remarks in the text do not apply.

'ad honestas nuptias.' But it was not 'cestus' but the expression 'cestus Latinus' that required defence, and still more the ablative 'cestu' for 'cesto.'

Ten lines below (*n.* on 23) another unattested word is proposed, *niuens* 'blinking' (for 'coniuens'). Even worse appears at II. v. 28 '*legendum puto bibitique.*' See Neue-Wagener's *Formenlehre* iii. p. 540, and *C.R.* xvi. p. 113.

ib. 131 *sin* (text) is nearer to *M* than Baehrens' *si in*, which however is more usual Latinity. [In 180 the same editor's *ea* is as near to *M*'s *et* as Otto's *haec* and less cacophonous 'Dacasque (*haec gloria maior*).']

ib. 203 *uiduae* (text) for *M*'s *nitidae* is ingenious and possible.

iii. 51

quicquid et argento primum uel in aere minori
ludit et enormes manus est experta colossos.

expertura (text) would remove a real difficulty. But I fail to see how *et* can then stand. Perhaps *luserit* (subj.) should be read.

iv. 4 *es caelo diues Germanice cordi.* So *M* reads, and I have conjectured *Diti es*, which Mr. Phillimore's note presents as *diti es*.² This correction has been reprehended (not by Mr. Phillimore) on the ground, as I must suppose, that the reference to *Dis* is inappropriate. My citation of *Hor. carm.* I. x. 19, 20 '*superis deorum gratus et imis*' (of the god Mercury) and the obvious reflexion that no emperor could have a higher compliment paid him than that the ruthless king of the underworld had as a favour to him relaxed his claims upon his minister should have protected it against the criticism. But a similar objection will prove fatal to Politian's lection *dine es* (text), unless an instance can be produced from imperial times of a living emperor so addressed.

ib. 97. After this verse a lacuna is marked in the text with considerable probability.

v. 32 *neu M, ne* (text) for no reason that I can see.

vi. 7, 8

dum refero diem beatum
laeti Caesaris ebriamque parcen.

For the mysterious corruption *parcen* Mr. Phillimore suggests *aparchen*, which I had thought of but could not support in the sense required. He cites Plutarch *de aud.* 40 B that is *ὡς περ ἐφ' ἐστίασιν ἱερῶν καὶ*

² Another correction of mine *cui pateat* V. iii. 183 is made unintelligible by the omission of *cui*.

θερίας ἀπαρχὴν παρελημμένον and Schol. ad Lucian. *Somm.* 9 i.e. τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον κέρδος ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς τιθεμένων ἀπαρχῶν ὥς οἱ ὁδοιποροὶ κατεσθίουσι. I doubt the sufficiency of these examples.

46 *uocare* (M) *uacare* (text) a conjecture which is worth attention.

II. i. 127

et uisae puero decrescere uestes
tum tibi quas †uestes† quae non ges-
tamina mitis
festinabat erus?

This passage raises the much debated question, within what limits may the same or similar words be repeated by an ancient author. Mr. Phillimore seems to have no canon. At I. ii. 24 his dislike of 'niueis' following 'niueos' at an interval of four lines inveigled him into an unhappy emendation. The same may be said of III. iii. 216 'sepulero' ('sepulcri' in 210, where II. vii. 72 has not deterred him from proposing the ill-attested form *piaculum*), and of IV. ii. 54 'sacro diffusus nectare uultus,' for which *uittas* is actually suggested and this in the teeth of *Achill.* i. 53. What, we may ask, were the *uittae* doing on Jupiter or the *nectar* on the *uittae*? Markland has removed the repetition far more satisfactorily by reading *uisus* for *uultus* in 52. On the other hand the sense of superfluity did not check him at IV. ii. 159, where *laudes* is proposed after *laudem* (158), nor at I. i. 65 'it fragor et—frangit.'

In our passage the obelus is abundantly justified, though I do not understand *quae-sisses*. Faute de mieux, Mr. Housman's *quas lanas* will do. It is possible however that *telas* should be removed here from 130, where it is intolerable.

On 198 Mr. Phillimore says undeniably 'haeret sensus.' His idea that the boy first plucks at Caesar's garments and then tries to take his hand is very attractive, and hence *magis* may have come from *manum*, as he suggests, or *manus*; but his other alterations are improbable.

Lower down in 203 he alters *uehit et into quae-rit*, and in 205 *porcit* M into *for-san* 'monente Slater,' but Prof. Slater (*J. Phil.* xxx. p. 139), in proposing *spondet*, says he 'firmly believes' that *forcit* is right. These changes will hardly convince, though it must be admitted that *porgit* is by no means altogether satisfactory.

iii. 69. Mr. Phillimore rightly keeps *secrete*, but also the untranslatable *quod*. Baehrens proposed *quo* as I have done;

NO. CLXXIX. VOL. XX.

but I doubt if he understood it,¹ as he altered *secrete* with Markland. Cf. the striking parallel I quoted from Tacitus, *Philologus*, l.c. p. 123.

74 *Elysiae* (text) *helisia* M. Mart. x. 24. 10 is cited, but *Elysia* puella does not prove *Elysia* alone. It is hard to decide if *Elysio* or *Elysium* is correct; cf. *Achill.* i. 921.

II. vi. 6 The text has *alter tamen et procul intrat alterius sensus* for *ad te—altius* in M—a proposal of merit.

II. vii. 28 *Tritonidi* (text). This conjecture of Bentley's seems hardly necessary. *Tritonis* = *oliua*, cf. Nemes. *Cyn.* 199, where Mr. Housman has rightly condemned *oliua* for a gloss. In this poem more regard should have been had to the allusions to the Pharsalia. Thus 67 is indeed corrupt or else a line is lost after it; but *fulmen* should not have been obelized nor *consumptum* (Slater *conuulsum*) conjectured, see Lucan i. 150 *sqq.* etc. The allusion in 90 to Lucan's words i. 70 *sq.* is only obscured by Mr. Slater's conjecture *pensa* for *fata*. For 100 see above p. 306.

III. i. 128. I am really sorry to see the corruption *ditesque Caprae* in an English editor's text. In every place of every ancient author, including *Siluae* III. ii. 23, where this place is mentioned, it is called *Caprae*. For the corruption see *Philologus*, l.c. p. 133.

Scarcely less distressing is it to find *Aenarumque* in the text at III. v. 104. These *Aenae* have been exhaled from a corruption 'Denarumque,' whose origin from 'inarimesque' is on its face. If there were a folk of this name, why did not Pliny mention them when he derived *Aenaria* from *Aeneas*, *N.H.* 3. 82?

ii. 70 *exigua fugimus* (text) for *fugimus exigua* M. If the MS. reading be inadmissible, this seems the best correction yet proposed.

iii. 143 *populo deduxit* (text Otto), *populos deduxit* M. *populo seduxit* (Baehrens) is as near to the MS. and a better way of expressing the sense required. Cf. *Hor. carm.* I. i. 30 *sq.* 'me gelidum nemus | Nympharumque leues cum Satyris chori | secernunt *populo*.' But Mr. Phillimore is apt to judge 'Baehrensian' conjectures by their authorship rather than their merit.

¹ If he did not, the correction is hardly his. It is not uncommon for this to happen. At IV. iii. 19 both Ellis and Riese have proposed *clauum*; but the first in the sense of 'nail' and the second in that of 'tiller.' One of these *clauum*'s is wrong, but Mr. Phillimore does not tell us which he takes.

IV. i. 24, 25. The old punctuation with its halting rhythm is retained. *moribus tuis* means 'for your sway' or 'direction'—not so rare a use that an editor of Statius should understand him to mean that the classes and the masses took heartfelt pleasure in the imperial character. Polster's ablative *lauribus* (note) is a false form.

iii. 23 *cauas harenas* for *grauas* is a good conjecture; not so the alternative *leuis*.

In *ib.* 89. *obluat* (M) a vox nihili is restored to the text. I wonder what meaning is attached to the preposition.

ib. 138. For *undaret* Mr. Phillimore and Mr. Slater propose *fronderet* which is as good as my *umbraret*.

ib. 159 *uades*, the second of Mr. Phillimore's suggestions, is superior in sense to the vulgate correction *scandes* but less near in its letters to *sondes* M. Mr. Slater's *frondes* may be right.

In the last line of the poem *senescet* (Heinsius) appears in the text. I cannot see why. The *donec* in line 160 means 'while' and takes its future, that in 162 'until' and takes its subjunctive.

v. 10

nunc uolucrum noui
questus inexpertumque carmen
quod tacita statuere bruma.

For *tacita statuere* Mr. Phillimore proposes *tacita tacuere*, an inelegance already commented on supra II. i. 127. The best emendation of *statuere* is an unpublished one by Mr. A. C. Clark. He proposes *studuere* = 'meditatae sunt,' comparing Pliny *N.H.* x. 83, where it is said of the nightingale '*meditantur aliae iuueniores uersusque quos imitentur accipiunt. audit discipula intentione magna et reddit uicibusque reticent. intellegitur emendatae correptio et in docente quaedam reprehensio.*'

ib. 22

hic mea carmina
regina bellorum uirago
Caesareo peramauit auro.

A capital instance of the harm which comes to scholarship from the prejudice which editors like Baehrens excite in their readers. A brilliant and certain emendation *redimiuit* has been completely disregarded. PER and RED were confused and IMIUIT turned into AMAUIT, cf. II. ii. 132, where M had originally *rades* and IV. vii. 19 where 'liticen' has become 'laticem.' Markland would have been the first to surrender his 'decorauit.' For the form see *Sil.* 7. 198.

viii. 40 *si* for *sed* is a good and, I think, a true conjecture.

V. i. 6 *Phidiaca uel nata* (or *uata*) *manu. -ue animata*, and *-ue novata* are suggested. The first is too far from the tradition. The second was my first conjecture (cf. *Philologus* p. 131). I rejected it later on two grounds, first the unusual rhythm for which I could find no exact parallel in any part of Statius, and second the doubt whether the collocation *-uel -ue* was a Statian one.

ib. 18 *sqq.* This passage is a touchstone of the method to be pursued in the *Siluae*, and this is why I devoted so much space to it in *Philologus*. Mr. Phillimore keeps the MS. text without an obelus, but in his note gets far enough along the right path to discern much of the truth.

sed cum plaga recens et adhuc in uulnere
primo
nigra domus questu miseramque accessus ad
aurem
coniugis orbatu tunc flere et scindere uestes
e.q.s.

He sees that the *que* after *miseram* is a wretched metrical makeshift of the kind of which I have given (*l.c.*) numerous instances from the *Siluae*, and building on Adrianus' *quis tum miserandam* he produces as a preferable remedy *miseram quis tunc*. This does not cure the passage, which should mean that in the first hours of bereavement it is vain to approach with words of comfort; for men are *mad* then and will not hear. The thought is not only that of II. i. 8 *sqq.*, from which I will now only quote the words '*insanos gemitus: stat pectore demens | luctus et admoto latrant praecordia tactu*' and of V. v. 23 '*tanta mihi feritas, tanta est insania luctus*,' but also of our passage if the sequel with its '*rabidis—querelis*' and '*attonito—pectore*' shows anything. *uesanam*, which I proposed to give the sense, is really an easier change than Mr. Phillimore's summary transposition, cf. *Philologus*, *l.c.* p. 132.

The *uesania* of the *orbis* may be illustrated from a passage lower down in this very poem, 197 *sqq.*

At iuuenis magno flammatus pectora luctu
nunc implet saeuo uiduos clamore penates,
nunc ferrum laxare cupit, nunc ardua
tendit
in loca (uix retinent comites), nunc ore
ligato
incubat amissae mersumque in corde dolorem
saeuus agit qualis conspecto coniugis igni

Odrysius uates positis ad Strymona plectris
obstupuit tristemque rogum sine carmine
fleuit.

So Barth has emended and Baehrens edited. But Mr. Phillimore, in spite of V. iii. 66 'uel quae primaevi coniugis ignem aspicit,' keeps the *conspicua coniuge segnis* of M. Men have erenow lost energy at the sight of their wives, but not Orpheus at that of Eurydice.

I will take yet another example, where an even more glaring corruption is still allowed to stand in the text. V. ii. 113 *sqq.*

ipse ego te nuper Tiberino in litore uidi,
qua Tyrrhena uadis Laurentibus aestuat
unda,
tendentem cursus uexantemque ilia nuda
calce ferocis equi, uultu dextraque minacem,
si qua fides dictis, stupui armatumque
putau.

Mirror te, Stati. quem Martio in campo
exerceri uidisti in equo, manus ac tela mi-
naci dextra intentantem, armatumque putasti?
nimirum tu eadem temeritate diuinandi
quem ad undas in ora maritima cum reti
uidisses, piscatorem, si qua dictis fides, pu-
tasses; quem in fluuio brachia ducentem,
natatorem. meliora sane potuisses a
Marklando edoceri a Britanno Romanus, cui
Martem in suo ipsum campo uersari minus
absonum esse uidebatur. testem is Byronum
poetam, modo aequalis fuisset, fortasse ad-
hibuisset qui ad rem satis similiter in Par-
thenone quem dicunt Mineruam uidisse se
finxit.

When, lo! a giant form before me strode
And Pallas hailed me in her own abode.
Byron, *The Curse of Minerva*.

Mr. Phillimore has nothing more to say for *armatum* than *fortasse vindicandum ex illo Sallustiano quod citat Quintil. Inst. Orat. viii. 3. 82*. How little this is may be seen from that author's words 'est uero pulcherrima (breuitas, *βραχυλογία*) cum plura paucis complectitur quale Sallustii est *Mithridates corpore ingenti, proinde armatus*.'

V. i. 230 *sic cautum membris for siccata membris* (M) is a fine and, I believe, a true emendation. Its effect is rather spoiled by the proposal of *infamantia for firmantia* just above.

ii. 83. I am glad to see *uisus*, which I conjectured for *iustus*, in the text, though Mr. Phillimore has taken it from a marginal

annotation in the Bodleian copy of the ed. of 1475.

110 '*nec se reus ipse tenebat*' (note, *tenebat* the ed. princeps) for '*nec te—timebat*' is attractive.

iii. 88 '*nec fida gauisam Pallada buxo*' (M). Mr. Phillimore puts into his text the useless and anticipated conjecture *bifida*, but adds in the note '*fida, def. Leo, Comment. in Siluas Gottingae 1893, p. 19,*' a reference which it would have been wiser and less unkind to omit. I will only add to my fuller treatment of the passage elsewhere that the construction of the passage '*Heliadum ramos lacrimosaeque germina—et Phrygium silicem*' strongly supports my contention that *buxum* is to be read with the other consequential changes *f(o)eda—Pallade* and either *ausam* or *gauisum*.

94 The suggestion (Praef.) that *cydaliben* has come from a shuffling of the letters of *bac(ch)ylides* is both ingenious and plausible; but the conjecture *Ceia fides* (it should be *Cea*), is from the nature of the case uncertain.

127 Hyele grauidus qua puppe magister
excidit et mediis miser euigilauit in
undis.

As Professor Ellis' *grauidus* for M's *grauis*, mentioned by Dr. Klotz and Mr. Slater, now appears in a text, I am constrained to state what it means. It means that Palinurus was pregnant. No wonder Sleep threw such a monster into the sea.

137. The note suggests *Euboica for Euboea*, a recognition of a real difficulty, and at 155 I rejoice to see *Leucade* once more 'in the text,' nor am I disconcerted to read *spernit Dom.* in the note. Rubbish from the pen of the same editor, e.g. the false quantity *lānea est* (183 *infr.*), might be removed from other parts of the apparatus.

266 *sqq.* are again in confusion. They have, since I wrote, been discussed by Mr. Housman in this Review (*l.c.*, p. 47). With his treatment in general I agree, except that I think him wrong in rejecting Mr. G. A. Davies' *quem tandem*, though the latter would have done better to delete the *et* before *uiuos*, as I should have said in *Philologus*, p. 136.

iv. 19 is perfectly sound. *transi*, which Statius has deliberately chosen as a contrast to *praeterit* 'passes by' (10), means 'fly across me.' I do not ask the slumbrous drench from your wings; a touch from your rod or the drops that fall as you fly over me will be enough. Barth seems to have understood the passage.

v. 46 nimirum cum uestra domus ego funera
maestus
inerepitans.

The impossible *uestra domus funera* has been set right by Dr. Klotz, but his excellent conjecture *modis*—*maestis* is not even mentioned.¹

¹ I take the opportunity of acknowledging this scholar's fair and courteous review of the Corpus text in Wölfflin's *Archiv.* for 1905.

Its tone is in marked contrast to that of another notice which appeared in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* about which I might say something.

The foregoing observations might easily be extended, but they will suffice to show my view of the last edition of the *Siluae*. In brief it is this. The book could be much improved by a thorough revision, but take it all in all, it contains the best modern text of the *Siluae* which has been separately published.

J. P. POSTGATE.

But it is not worth while, as Lucretius iii. 388-390 'nec repentis itum cuiusuisque animantis [sentimus nec priua pedum uestigia quaeque] Corpore quae in nostro culices et cetera ponunt' has already expressed my sentiments.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PHILLIMORE'S TRANSLATION OF PROPERTIUS.

MAY I be allowed a few lines of explanation in order to forestall a possible charge of literary theft?

In my translation of Propertius which has recently been published at the Clarendon Press, a number of corrections appear in footnote form without acknowledgment of authorship. The reason for this omission was that it appeared pedantic to encumber the page with a kind of information which has no interest for the general reader. But I am horrified to find a reviewer in the *Oxford Magazine* for June 6th crediting me with the authorship of many of these variants which belong to other scholars, living or dead. For example *Meropem* (II. xxxiv. 33) is the property of Bergk and Schneidewin; and I had no idea of robbing Mr. Housman of

vacans (II. xxvi. 53): in such cases I presumed that emendations already published would be familiar enough to the expert, while the layman would have no concern with property in such points.

But I wish now to make public acknowledgment that the emendation '*uterer et quamvis nomine*' (II. xxiv. 8) belongs by priority to Mr. O. L. Richmond of King's. I was unconscious, when this correction struck me (in correcting the proofs of my translation) that it had been suggested by anybody, but Mr. Richmond reminds me that he communicated it to me in a conversation that we had two years ago. So it is his; and should be added to the list in the Preface of conjectures other than my own and hitherto unpublished.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

TRIREMES.

It surely is 'quite beyond dispute' that 'in the Acropolis relief the tholes of the thranite oars are vertically above the portholes of the thalamite oars.' If I rightly understand Mr. Newman's observations, *supra* p. 280, his point is that, if we had a section of the ship at right-angles to the plane of this relief, these tholes would not be ver-

tically above these portholes. But I have not asserted that they would.

Mr. Newman says that 'the shadow of the upper wale is much greater than those of the lower wales of the ship, and seems to indicate not merely a gunwale, but a gallery of some amplitude.' It does not seem to me to indicate more than a gunwale. And there is this difficulty about the gallery:—The remains of the Athenian docks show that

the triremes were not more than 20 ft. in width. If the triremes had a gallery 'of some amplitude' on each side of the hull, the hull itself would be so narrow that it would hardly have capacity enough to hold the crew or displacement enough to float its weight.

CECIL TORR.

SCARABS.

Scarabs: an Introduction to the Study of Egyptian Seals and Signet Rings. By PERCY E. NEWBERRY. Pp. xvi + 218. 44 Plates and 116 Text-Illustrations. London: Constable, 1906. 18s. net.

SCARABS are to the friend of Egyptian antiquity what coins or gems are to the lover of classical art. This has often been said, and, though a somewhat exaggerated simile, it still makes clear to those who are more familiar with the art of Greece and Rome the peculiar position which the scarab occupies in Egyptian art. Perhaps we might with more justice and less exaggeration say that the scarab is to Egyptian art what the netsuké is to that of Japan. The Greek coin or gem, the Egyptian scarab, the Japanese netsuké, all have identical qualities which make them dear to the collector's heart. They are small, to rest in the palm of the hand and be admired, and when they are not precisely beautiful, they are at least curious and they may have some great historical interest of their own: this coin may be the only monument of a lost Greek Kingdom of Hither Asia, that scarab may be the only relic of a Hyksos king, that netsuké may have been worn by the greatest of Tokugawa shoguns. In the case of the scarab there are, apart also from the general matter of beautiful or quaint workmanship and design, the hundred nuances of these which are unknown to all save its devotees: the many variations of form, material, and nature and colour of glaze which give the criteria by which they know their scarabs, and can say that this is a good thing, and that of no account, or that this is contemporary with the king whose name it bears, while that is much later in date. This knowledge, like that of connoisseurs of coins, gems, or netsukés, comes only with much handling and comparing of many specimens, till nuances of colour and appearance of glaze or minute varieties of design-cutting can be distinguished which are invisible to him who has not handled and studied scarabs with care and a 'comparing' mind.

Mr. Newberry's book, which lies before us, will be of interest to the archaeological readers of the *Classical Review* in connexion with Mycenaean or Minoan research or the tomb and temple finds of Etruria, Rhodes, or Ephesus. In Crete and Cyprus Egyptian scarabs are found with Mycenaean remains, in Etruria, at Kameiros, at Ephesus with Etruscan or Greek relics of the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C. Invariably the 'Mycenaean' scarabs or rings are of the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty or earlier (before 1400 B.C.): invariably those of the earlier Greek period are of the contemporary XXVth Dynasty. It is sometimes asked: why cannot this scarab of Amenhetep III or Queen Tii, or this ring of Khuenaten have been made at a later date than that of the monarchs whose name it bears? Why need they and the Mycenaean things with which they are found date to 1400 B.C.? The archaeologist may then explain that certain types of scarabs or rings of Amenhetep III can only be contemporary with that king, while no later instance of the name of Queen Tii is known, and no later commemoration of the abominable arch-heretic Khuenaten, whose name every later Egyptian would strive to forget, could ever possibly have taken place.

Mr. Newberry's introduction contains much matter of interest on the subject of the various nuances of type and glaze which tell us so much, though we could have wished that he had written rather more at length on this subject and also that he had devoted more space to the later scarabs of the Ramesside period and the XXVth Dynasty. It is true that the scarabs of the Middle Kingdom and the XVIIIth Dynasty are of greater beauty and interest than the later ones, but we think that the amount of space he has allotted to these latter is disproportionately small. The later types are worth more careful working out, and deserve a fuller description than simple references to the collections in which they are found (e.g. Plate XXXIV, description on p. 179), while their XIIth Dynasty brethren are honoured with full translations of their (often difficult) inscriptions.

Mr. Newberry will not have it that any scarabs exist that are older than the VIth Dynasty, but it does not yet seem absolutely certain that none of the scarabs which bear the names of Khufu, Khafra, and Menkaura are contemporary with those kings. This opinion is based on certain peculiarities of shape, size, and glaze which seem to differentiate some of these scarabs from the

undoubted XXVIth Dynasty ones with the names of the Pyramid-kings. Mr. Newberry's oldest scarab is, however, one of Merenra, of the VIth Dynasty, which 'closely resembles in style and technique a very small and distinctive class of scarab-seal which has been recently found in association with button-shaped seals in graves of the intermediate period between the end of the Old Kingdom and the beginning of the Twelfth Dynasty' (p. 68). These 'button-shaped seals' Mr. Newberry dates between the VIth and XIIth Dynasties, and makes them the immediate predecessors of the scarabs, a transition-form, so to speak, between the older cylinder-seals and the scarabs. We do not quite gather whether Mr. Newberry considers the scarab to have evolved out of the button-seal, but if he does, the adoption of the scarab-form does not seem very explicable. It would seem more probable that the scarab-seal was really of independent origin, and we have seen reason to believe that it was in use as far back as the time of the IVth Dynasty.

The button-seals are interesting on account of their resemblance to similar seals from Crete and the Italian *Terramare* and cave-deposits, 'from which we may perhaps infer that they are of common origin' (p. 60). Both they and certain cylinder-seals of the same date are often engraved with representations of monstrous animals, which, as Dr. Arthur Evans pointed out, are identical with early Cretan pictographs. Dr. Evans's view that these resemblances and those of the spirals on Egyptian XIIth Dynasty scarabs and Cretan seal-stones shew an artistic connexion between the Northern and Southern shores of the Mediterranean about 3000 B.C. is of course now generally accepted. Mr. Newberry's figures of some of the Egyptian designs (pp. 49, 56-61) will be of interest to Greek archaeological students.

The mention of cylinder-seals reminds us that Mr. Newberry does not treat of scarabs alone, but of Egyptian seals generally. In fact he starts with the thesis that the scarab was primarily a seal and that its use as an amulet was secondary. We think that this view needs some modification. In the majority of cases there can be no doubt that the scarab was never the seal of a living man. A glance at the plates will shew the reader who has any knowledge of the hieroglyphs that the names of most of the officials commemorated on them are followed by the signs *maa-kheru*, 'deceased'. They commemorated dead men, and either originally

belonged to their tomb-furniture or were dedicated as memorials of them in the necropolises.¹ Therefore they were never used as seals. Scarabs were also strung together in necklaces and dedicated as votive offerings in the temples, as to Hathor at Deir el-Bahari. Some of these are inscribed, some not. The large 'heart scarabs', which Mr. Newberry does not mention in his book, were purely religious in their signification, and were used as amulets to protect the dead man in the next world. They too have inscriptions on their bases (the 'Heart-chapter' of the 'Book of the Dead'), but they were not seals. Among others which can never have been used as seals are those of the late period which were bought at Thebes by pilgrims as mementos, inscribed 'A good coming to Karnak' (like 'A present from Margate') or were sent as new year's gifts like the scarab (Pl. xl. 8) wishing that Ptah may give 'A Happy New Year to the prince Shashank, whose mother was Karomama deceased' (this is the correct translation: Mr. Newberry seems to be mistaken in his rendering on p. 78).

Mr. Newberry would of course agree that such scarabs can never have been used as seals, but would say that originally the scarab was a seal, and not an amulet. That it was a seal is certain, but it seems more probable that from the earliest times the *scarab* was a religious amulet as well as a seal, while the cylinder never had any religious signification.

Mr. Newberry's description of the use of the seal in Egypt, and of the various classes of officials who carried the seal as the badge of their office, is interesting: the study of the Egyptian bureaucracy he has made specially his own. It may be noted by the way that the usual idea that a scarab or ring bearing a king's name must necessarily have belonged to that king is erroneous: it may have been the signet of a royal official or be purely commemorative: at all periods, from the time of the XIIth Dynasty to the end, scarabs with royal names were made in hundreds for loyal subjects to buy for use as amulets.

Mr. Newberry's plates, drawn by himself, give very accurate reproductions of the seal-designs and the book, though it has shortcomings (whose has not?), will be of

¹ It is true that instances are known of the epithet *maa-kheru* being applied to a living person, but we do not think that this could have been the case with regard to all the persons commemorated on the scarabs: it is more natural to take the phrase in its usual sense, and to regard the object on which it occurs as the memorial of a dead man.

use to archaeological students as well as of interest to the 'devotees of the scarab.'

H. R. HALL.

FURTWÄNGLER'S EXCAVATIONS IN AEGINA.

Aegina: Das Heiligtum der Aphaia. Unter Mitwirkung von E. R. FIECHTER und H. THIERSCH herausgegeben von A. FURTWÄNGLER. Mit 130 Tafeln, 1 Karte, 6 Beilagen und 413 Abbildungen im Text. Two vols. 4to. München: Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1906. Price M. 120.

THE archaeological world has been for some time eagerly expecting Professor Furtwängler's publication of the results of his recent excavations at Aegina, results of which he gave a summary at a meeting of the Archaeological Congress at Athens last year. The first and most important part of this publication has speedily appeared, dealing with the well known temple and its surroundings; and he would be a very unreasonable person who found it in any way disappointing. Beyond question, this is among the most noteworthy archaeological productions of our time. It not only exhibits throughout the astonishing knowledge possessed by the editor alike of ancient monuments and of modern literature in regard to them, but it is worked out in every part with a conscientious thoroughness which could scarcely be surpassed. The method of Furtwängler is one of extreme vigour and rigour. He proceeds to make up his mind as to the precise character and meaning of every work and every fragment with which he has to deal, and to follow out to the end every consequence which can be drawn from that verdict in regard to any part of our knowledge of antiquity. The labour involved is enormous; and when one reflects that the excavations at Aegina were only begun in 1901, one wishes that something of Furtwängler's spirit could be infused into other excavators.

Even extreme thoroughness is not without its snares; and the determination to be definite and precise may lead a writer into dogmatism, or into the construction of great systems of hypothesis which rest on an insufficient amount of evidence. It is clear that the method is least satisfactory in its working when the monuments dealt with are

of mixed character and doubtful period. On the other hand, its advantages are greatest, and its risks smallest, in dealing with a definite group of monuments of which the time and the place are fixed. Such a group are the sculptures of Aegina: thus in the book before us we find Furtwängler's methods working in the most effective way, and with diminished risks. He has, in my opinion, reached far more satisfactory results in dealing with the Aeginetan marbles than in the *Masterpieces*. In fact he may be said to have reached a standard of thoroughness in work of this kind hitherto attained only by a few books such as the great publication on Olympia.

It is clear that any criticisms which I should have to make, after a single rapid perusal, of a book which is such a monument of laborious thought, could have but small value. I shall therefore in the main content myself with giving a brief summary of the contents.

The editor begins by vindicating the temple of Aegina as dedicated not to Zeus or to Athena, but to the almost unknown goddess Aphaia, one of the many varieties of Artemis. The proof is based on inscriptions, which certainly clearly shew that there was a shrine of Aphaia on the site from a very early period, though some authorities maintain that they do not shew this shrine to have been the *chief* building on the spot. Pausanias however mentions a temple of Aphaia as on the way to that of Zeus Panhellenius, and says that Pindar wrote an ode about her. Furtwängler advocates the reading 'Αφαίης for 'Αθηναίης in Herodotus ii. 59; and thinks that the shrine or shrines of Athena which certainly existed in the island of Aegina were only set up at the time of the Athenian conquest, after the Persian war.

The temple of Aphaia was first excavated in 1811 by the architect Cockerell and Baron Haller. The record of the co-operation of these two friends in their great enterprise is full of charm. No friction and no dispute seems to have intervened between the Englishman and the German. Cockerell is the more brilliant figure. Handsome, wealthy, enthusiastic, overflowing with talent and generosity, he devoted himself for years to the study of the Aegina sculptures, publishing his great book about them, *The Temples of Aegina and Bassae*, as late as 1860, after fifty years' incubation. But Haller also brought something to the task, German care and thoroughness, which Cockerell enthusiastically valued.

Fortunately the union of men of different countries in a great scientific task is still possible; and it is to be hoped that the recent federation of the Academies of Europe will make it more and more common.

The architectural section of the book is by Dr. E. R. Fiechter; and is worked out in exactest detail. Perhaps the most interesting question with which it is concerned is the existence or non-existence of temples previous to that of the time of the Persian wars with which we are familiar. According to Fiechter there had existed on part of the site of this shrine a small temple *in antis* without surrounding columns, the internal plan of which is closely like that of the earliest Athena temple of the Athenian Acropolis. Since the foundations of this building lie under the existing temple, they can scarcely be investigated, but considerable fragments of column and entablature were discovered, on the evidence of which Dr. Fiechter restores not only the ground plan of the temple, but even its elevation and colouring (Pls. 59-61). Contemporary with it appear to have been an altar, a propylon, and other buildings. In regard to the temple now largely extant Dr. Fiechter has much new information. He shews that it was not hypaethral, as Cockerell supposed. He identifies a spot about 92 centimètres broad and 112 deep as the space covered by the basis of the cultus statue, which seems to have been of small size and in a seated attitude. He proves that the opisthodomus of the temple was completely fenced in, and apparently used as an adytum, the door of approach from the temple being small and (probably for some sacred reason) not in the middle of the west wall. He finds a near architectural parallel in the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, happily reconstructed by the French excavators of that wonderful site.

It is however to the sculptures of the great temple that we naturally turn. Here Dr. Furtwängler had a great opportunity, and he has used it to the very utmost. Students of the Aegina Pediments must have long felt two drawbacks, diminishing their extraordinary merit, first that the individual figures as restored by Thorwaldsen were brought too near to a fixed pattern, and second, that the accepted arrangement in the Pediments was too hard and conventional, with overstrained balance, and too great detachment of figures. There can scarcely be any question of the removal of Thorwaldsen's restorations, for where he added he

cut down the broken surfaces to a smooth face; so that if the limbs he added were removed, the warriors of Aegina would all look as if they had been through the operating room. In fact evidence as to junctures has largely disappeared, a fact which seems to have long ago disturbed Cockerell's mind. But in the other matter, that of composition and arrangement, Furtwängler is able to set forth striking novelties. The reasons for complete rearrangement are set forth succinctly on pp. 192-195. The existing stereotyped arrangement has little authority; it is but one of the many schemes successively tried by Cockerell—and it is inconsistent with certain definite new facts. For example, the discovery of a hand, grasping a stone which rested on the base of the pediment, is held to prove the existence of a fourth wounded man in the West (more archaic) Pediment, in addition to the three already recognized; and moreover this base of the pediment, many fragments of which were recovered, proves by the depressions into which the figures were set that Athena stood on the outer edge of this pediment, with two warriors striding out on either side from behind her. The centripetal arrangement of the whole is thus disproved: Athena must have stood invisible in the midst, with groups fighting over a fallen hero on either side. The two archers on either side also discharge their shafts not towards the middle of the pediment, but into the angles.

The arrangement of the Eastern (Herales) Pediment is quite as completely upset. Here the new arrangement gives us Athena in the midst, and on either side of her a warrior striking at a foe who is in the act of falling into the arms of an unarmed follower.

Whether the new grouping will in all details hold its own is of course a question as to which it would be premature to express an opinion. It is quite a new light that artists of the period of the Aeginetans would choose to sculpture a figure in the act of falling. Furtwängler is able to cite (p. 502) a small archaic bronze figure at Modena, in very nearly the position required: but this figure stands isolated. Also to construct an entire wounded hero, turning his back to the spectator, when all that actually exists of him is part of a hand holding a stone, is very bold, though of course not therefore unjustified.

Another very surprising discovery of the excavators is that the sculptured remains belong not to two pediments, but to three, and that the third pediment was even

completed with a tall acroterion. The fragments (mostly heads) belonging to this third pediment were found almost exclusively at the east end of the temple; but in style they are slightly more archaic than even the figures of the west end. The explanation suggested by Furtwängler is that at least three artists competed in the production of pedimental groups; and that three of these groups were thought worthy of permanent preservation.

After losing one's breath over Furtwängler's astonishing innovations, one recovers it with the discovery that he is conservative as regards the date and meaning of the sculptures. They belong to the time of the Persian war, and they commemorate the two great expeditions against Troy, that of Telamon and Heracles and that of Agamemnon and Achilles, though as regards the latter expedition it is not possible to pick out any particular battle or episode as the subject of the Western Pediment.

No trace has been found of any metopes belonging to the temple. They can scarcely have been of marble sculpture. They may have consisted, as Furtwängler suggests, of wood. Or possibly they were adorned, not with sculpture but with painting.

One valuable feature of the great work on Olympia is here missing: there is no plate in which the exact places where the various fragments were found are marked. No doubt any such plate, if attempted, must have been incomplete, as the earlier excavators did not leave on record the exact localities where figures came to light. Doubtless the editor considered this point, and decided that it would be of no use to attempt a plate on the Olympian model. The *finding-places* of the figures in the different pediments are distinct, the temple intervening between the Eastern and Western remains; the remains of the third pediment were found near the east end of the temple, but apparently not quite where they had fallen. The exact place of this third pediment cannot therefore be determined with certainty.

It might well seem sufficient contents for a great book to bring before the learned world a complete rearrangement of the Aegina sculptures. But the chips of Furtwängler's workshop are in some cases of very considerable importance. On such subjects as the colouring of ancient sculpture, and the principles of pedimental arrangement, he pours out a great wealth of observation argument and theory. As a trifle thrown in, he publishes (p. 323) what

are among the most important unpublished Greek statues in existence, those preserved in the museum at Chalcis in Euboea, an Athena, and a Theseus carrying off Antiope. These striking works are, Furtwängler says, the finest Greek archaic sculptures in existence; from a careful examination of them, I can confirm his judgment. They resemble, but surpass, the figures of the time immediately preceding the Persian war found on the Athenian Acropolis. They are regarded as part of a pediment of the temple of Apollo Daphnephorus at Eretria.

It is easily to be understood that Professor Furtwängler's methods of working compel him to frequent changes of opinion in regard to matters on which he has already written. It is to be noticed that the Athena Medici of the École des Beaux Arts at Paris which was last heard of in Furtwängler's writings as occupying a place in the East Pediment of the Parthenon (*Intermezzi*, p. 29) has now once more reverted to her old position as a copy of the so-called bronze Promachos of Pheidias on the Acropolis. The view as to the representation of the *Volneratus* of Cresilas on a vase (*Meisterwerke*, p. 280) is entirely withdrawn, and so forth. This willingness to change one's view on the production of new evidence or fresh arguments shews alike candour and vitality. But at the same time, when one turns back to the places where these superseded views were set forth, and notices with what confidence they were proclaimed, one has to allow that the faculty for weighing evidence is not so trustworthy as some other powers of Furtwängler's remarkable intelligence.

The third colleague in the production of this book, Dr. Thiersch, has undertaken the inscriptions and the smaller antiquities. The inscriptions are few, but of course important as evidence as to the deity to whom the temple belonged: the name of Aphaia occurs on no less than three of them. Among small objects the pins and fibulae are conspicuous; and Dr. Thiersch puts himself in line with his colleagues by a careful investigation of the use of these forms of fastening respectively in Greek dress at various times.

The last chapter of the volume of text is again by Professor Furtwängler, and consists of a concise history of the shrine of Aphaia from first to last. This chapter concludes one of the most laborious, most careful, and most striking records of discovery and research which our times have seen. If it had been followed by an index, which,

strangely enough is wanting, the finish would have been still better.

P. GARDNER.

A NOTE ON THE ENNEACRUNUS.

At page 131 of Miss Jane Harrison's *Primitive Athens* the following statement occurs: 'It may be taken therefore as certain that, in the seventeenth century, remains of an "Enneakrunos" and of a theatre-like building near it, existed.' This inference rests on the brief mention, p. 130, of a 'curious old plan then drawn by Guillet and Coronelli,' and a cut of a portion of Coronelli's plan is given. Coronelli's work has of course no independent authority whatever. It is merely a somewhat inaccurate copy of Guillet's, slightly influenced by Spon in all probability, and certainly affected by documents which originated in the time of the Venetian siege. (See *Harvard Studies in Class. Philol.* vii, pp. 177 ff.) This, however, is but a detail. The fact of interest is that Guillet's (Capuchin) map, or a later one much like it, is in positive terms stated to afford proof of the existence of the Enneacrunus in the seventeenth century, on the spot where Dörpfeld would place it.

This is, I believe, the first time that such a view, expressed some years ago by Prof. Dörpfeld, has found its way into English print, and I venture to think that its truth will be accepted by few who have studied Guillet's *Athènes* with any care and compared his statements and map with what is said about this point of Athenian topography in Spon's *Voyage* (Lyons edition, ii, pp. 162, and 209) and Wheeler's *Journey* (p. 383). The authority of the map and Prof. Dörpfeld's views about it are discussed in the *Harvard Studies* xii, pp. 221 ff. There are no doubt many good reasons for believing that the Enneacrunus was where Prof. Dörpfeld would place it, but the evidence of the map in question is not one of them. Judeich (*Topographie von Athen*, p. 185), who has evidently studied the maps with great care, ends his account of location of the Enneacrunus with these sensible words, 'von der alten Enneakrunos fand sich damals (in der Byzantinerzeit) keine Spur mehr vor.'

J. R. WHEELER.

FURTWÄNGLER'S *ATHLETICS IN GREEK ART*.

Die Bedeutung der Gymnastik in der Griechischen Kunst. A. FURTWÄNGLER. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1905. 8vo. Pp. 15. 9 Illustrations. 80 Pf.

GREEK art, says Professor Furtwängler, is inseparable from Greek athletics. It excels especially in the representation of the human figure, and the idea that inspires it is that of the trained athlete as seen in the daily life of the palaestra. Other nations have given equal attention to the training of the body, but no other age or nation has combined the necessary athletic training with the artistic ability to reproduce it.

The athletic ideal is marked even in archaic art by the treatment of the muscles of the body, it finds its perfect realisation in the fifth century, giving a unity to all the diversities of individual artists and being traceable even in the representation of the female figure, and it survives through all the changes of Hellenistic and Roman art. Its charm is due to the position of athletics in Greek education. In the harmonious development of body and mind gymnastic and music were indissolubly united, and the physical beauty produced thereby was regarded as the expression of the spirit within. Hence the art of the fifth century not merely delights the eye but produces a sense of freshness and power, of courage and resolution combined with self-control.

These general considerations are illustrated by a few typical examples. The subject is a wide one and deserves fuller treatment than is possible within the limits of a magazine article. For example the connection between the decline of Greek athletics and Greek art and the diversity of athletic type produced by specialisation are questions full of interest from the artistic and the educational point of view. In his criticism of modern art Professor Furtwängler hardly makes adequate allowance for the influence of clothing. Even the scanty garments of our modern athletes are sufficient to disguise the muscles of the trunk, to the treatment of which he ascribes much of the effect of Greek sculpture. But if he is somewhat hard on the artistic powers of our countrymen, the much-abused English schoolmaster will at least find some consolation in his admission that all is not well with education even in Germany and that 'in spite of theory the system of education in German Gymnasien

results in little more than a cramming with indifferent knowledge.'

E. NORMAN GARDINER.

ALTMANN'S ROMAN SEPULCHRAL ALTARS.

Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit. Von WALTER ALTMANN. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1905. 11 x 8 in. 1 Vol. Pp. 306. 208 Illustrations in the Text and 2 Heliogravure Plates. 18 M.

THE Roman sepulchral monuments have none of the grace and charm inseparably connected with Greek funeral *stelai*. Apart from the inferiority of the Romans in artistic gifts, the reason for this is to be found in the intensely practical character of the race, a character which reveals itself in the double purpose served by a large proportion of these monuments. They were at once receptacles for holding the ashes of the dead and (perhaps primarily) altars of libation and sacrifice. In keeping with this sternly practical character are the inscriptions engraved on the altars. As a rule, they give little more than the name of the erector and the name and age of the deceased.

The present work has for its object the classification and discussion of the Roman sepulchral altars of the Empire. Naturally it is of the greatest importance to establish a chronological sequence of types. The data for this are somewhat scanty, but by the aid of clues afforded either by the names of persons known to history, or by distinctive styles of garb and head-dress, a probable order can be evolved. An interesting example of a date derived from literary evidence occurs in the case of the monument of Minicia Marcella, whose death is mentioned by Pliny in a letter (v. 16) to his friend Marcellinus (not to the bereaved father Fundanius, as is wrongly stated on p. 34). With such helps the altars are arranged according to the leading motive of their decoration. To the Augustan period belong those with bucrania and garlands. The Claudian monuments have rams' heads and heads of Jupiter Ammon at their angles; these in turn give way to figures of Victory. To Flavian and Trajanic times are assigned the altars decorated with torches and columns.

Though the altars of the Augustan age show more refinement and restraint in their decoration, those of the succeeding periods

have a greater human interest. Not until Claudian times do portraits appear actually on the tombstones, while it is in the Flavian period that they become most common. Here Roman art, though not independent of Hellenistic influence, shows its greatest originality. The second century witnesses the development of subject representations on altars, though they occur more frequently on ordinary gravestones. We see the priest, the peasant, the artisan, the child with his playthings—all sorts and conditions of men. One of the most interesting is the monument to the cutler L. Cornelius Atimetus, who is shown in his workroom and shop with all the instruments of his craft around him (p. 172 f.).

The book gives a valuable collection of sepulchral altars, arranged with care and skill. The author has taken great pains to bring out the connection of their decoration with contemporary wall paintings and stucco-designs. The illustrations are good. The chief ground of complaint here is on the score of arrangement. It is of course impossible in all cases to put the illustration next to the corresponding description. But in this work we find blocks sometimes quite unnecessarily banished from their proper position in the text. (Why, for instance, should not figs. 112 and 113 have been put on their proper page—138? Again, on p. 125 is the description of the altar of Livia Ephyre; the illustration is on p. 129. No reference is given from one to the other.) Under these circumstances references should certainly have been placed beneath the illustrations to guide the reader to the proper description. References from description to illustration are not sufficient. Such omissions do not indeed detract from the essential merits of the book, but they are somewhat of a trial to the reader's patience.

F. H. MARSHALL.

CARTER'S RELIGION OF NUMA.

The Religion of Numa and other essays on the Religion of ancient Rome. By JESSE BENEDICT CARTER. London: Macmillan and Co. 1906. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 184. 3s. 6d. net.

MR. WARDE FOWLER in his admirable book on the Roman Festivals devoted most of his attention to the study of native Roman ritual and purposely neglected extraneous elements. There was therefore room for an

account of the development, or rather of the deterioration, of the Roman religion under the influence of foreign cults. The present book fills this gap in a very interesting, though unpretentious, way. The author freely acknowledges his debt to Professor Wissowa, and his obligations to him are indeed evident throughout. But we find unmistakable signs of an independent judgment as well as much freshness of illustration. The five essays which make up the work describe the half-animistic religion of Numa, the Servian reorganisation, the invasion of Greek deities under the aegis of the Sibylline books, the fatal advent of the ecstatic worship of the East, and finally the short-lived Augustan revival.

One piece of criticism may perhaps be ventured upon. Is it not possible that excessive stress is laid upon the formalism and spiritual inadequacy of the Roman religion? Our ideas as to the effect of that religion upon the hearts and characters of its votaries must not be derived from the conduct of the mob at Rome. Roman religion was essentially a religion for the tiller of the soil, and it was away from the baneful influences of the city that its saving power was best exemplified and most thoroughly understood. The ceremonies of the Roman Festivals may have been minute and often (to our minds) bordering on the ridiculous. But the provincial-bred Livy knew something of the secret of the Roman character at its best when he wrote: *parva sunt haec, sed parva ista non contemnendo maiores nostri maximam hanc rem fecerunt.*

In the useful references to recent literature given in the Index more frequent mention might have been made of Boissier's *La religion romaine* which gives an excellent account of the Augustan revival and treats of many points beside that of Emperor-worship. The printer's error (on p. 101) of 'symbols' for 'cymbals' may be mentioned as a curiosity.

F. H. MARSHALL.

BRIEF NOTICES.

Der Blitz in der Orientalischen und Griechischen Kunst. Von PAUL JACOBSTHAL. Berlin, 1906. Pp. 60; four plates. M. 3.60.

THE writer traces the development in art of the well-known symbol of Zeus, which first appears in the art of Assyria (but not in Egypt, where storms were seldom known),

in the simple form of a double zigzag line, which gradually becomes triple, obviously representing a lightning flash. About the eighth century its form was doubled, and that conception was taken over by the Greeks, whose decorative instincts however tended to convert it into the form of a flower, especially the familiar motive of the lotus-bud or blossom. The writer quotes as an interesting parallel the 'Red Flower' of Kipling's *Jungle Book*; but he does not appear to have realised how often the trident of Poseidon was treated in the same fashion. He points out that different varieties of the flower-thunderbolt are found in Ionic and in western Greek art. Subsequently the flower-type gives way to more naturalistic treatment, and the weapon becomes barbed like a bunch of arrows, or is furnished with wings as on the coins of Elis. The plates give some seventy instances of variant forms, from Greek and earlier art.

Aus den Phönikischen Nekropolen von Malta. Von ALBERT MAYR. (Separat-Abdruck aus den Sitzungsberichten der philos.-philol. und der hist. Klasse der kgl. Bayer. Akad. der Wissensch. 1905, Heft III.). München, 1905. Pp. 32; four plates.

AN interesting record of finds in Maltese tombs, which include various funeral sculptures and forms of coffins. Among the latter is an anthropoid sarcophagus of terracotta; this the author regards as illustrative of a Phoenician custom of the fifth-third centuries, and claims as peculiar to Malta. But they are not unknown in Cyprus. Among the pottery are some interesting Greek vases of various periods, a few Corinthian and black-figured; those of later date come from the South Italian workshops, and include a fine krater *a campana*. A study of the burial-customs shews that inhumation was practised down to the end of the third century, when burning became customary. The monograph will be useful as a record of some little-known discoveries.

H. B. W.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NUMISMATIC SUMMARIES.

American Journal of Archaeology. Vol. x. Part I. 1906.

1. O. M. Washburn and A. Frickenhaus: The Building Inscriptions of the Erechtheum. (Four plates.)

The text of certain inscriptions (one new) is given by Mr. Washburn, with some proposed new

readings, and explanatory comments by Herr Frickenhaus. They tend to shew that the walls were built in 409, the east cella in 408, and the whole roofed and completed in 407.

2. O. M. Washburn: Excavations in Corinth in 1905; Preliminary Report. (Plate and cut.)
3. G. P. Stevens: The East Wall of the Erechtheum. (Four plates, fourteen cuts.)
Discoveries tending to prove that the east wall had a central door with a window each side, and that the building was therefore planned to be a well-lighted religious museum.
4. R. Norton: Report of Director, American School in Rome.
5. Report on researches of the Archaeological Institute of America.
6. Proceedings of Seventh General Meeting, 1905 (with abstracts of archaeological papers).
7. Archaeological News (ed. H. N. Fowler).

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. xxvi. Part I. 1906.

1. E. Strong: Statue of a Boy leaning on a Pillar. (Two plates.)
2. E. N. Gardiner: The Pankration and Wrestling. III. (Three plates; nine cuts.)
3. F. W. Hasluck: Poemanenum. (Plate.)
4. J. G. Milne: Clay-sealings from the Fayum. (Seventeen cuts.)
5. L. Dyer: Details of the Olympian 'Treasures.' (Fourteen cuts.)
6. J. L. Myres: On the 'List of Thalassocracies' in Eusebius.
7. P. Ure: The Origin of the Tyrannis.
8. A. J. B. Wace: The Topography of Pelion and Magnesia. (Map; twelve cuts.)
9. E. A. Gardner: The Atalanta of Tegea. (Cut.)
10. H. R. Hall: The Pyramid of Moeris.
11. W. H. D. Rouse: Inscriptions from Astypalaea.
12. H. S. Cowper: The Rock-cut Statue near Manissa.
13. Notices of Books.

H. B. W.

Revue numismatique. Part I, 1906.

J. de Foville. 'Etudes,' etc. On Greek, etc. scarabaei in the French Cabinet. (i) Herakles crowned by Eros. Greek, assigned to the fifth century B.C. (ii) Graeco-Italian. Theseus putting on the sandals of his father Aegeus.—A. Dieudonné. 'Une monnaie des Aleuades à Larissa.' The rev. inscr. ΕΛΛΑ on this coin does not refer to Hellas, but is probably the name of Hellanokrates, a member of the family of the Aleuades. The head of Aleuas appears on the *obv.* of the coin.—J. Maurice. 'L'iconographie par les médailles' (continued). Deals with the portraiture of Constantius II. and Constans II. The portraits of both on coins are much alike but they can be distinguished from Constantine II. by certain characteristics referred

to, p. 29.—'Choix de monnaies, etc. du Cabinet de France.' Coins of Magna Graecia.—Review, by A. Blanchet, of Macdonald's Hunterian Catalogue, Vol. III.

Journal international d'arch. numismatique. Parts 3 and 4, 1905.

C. Gerojannis. 'Greek Coins.' Includes a large bronze coin with types Head of Athena and Ship's prow. This has been assigned to Chersonesus in Crete, but I long ago (Brit. Mus. Cat. *Crete*, p. xxxvii) ventured to dispute this attribution. The present specimen was found in Rhodes, and Gerojannis suggests that it belongs to the city of Rhodes.—Svoronos. *Νομίσματα Ἐθεῶν*. A coin of an unknown people of Thessaly or Epirus, perhaps, as Svoronos suggests, the *Ἐθνεῖς*, *ἔθνος Θεσσαλίας*, of our texts of Steph. Byz. The three known specimens have been procured, one in Chalcis of Euboea, two in Epirus. *Obv.* ΖΕΥΣ ΕΘΕΤΩΝ

Head of Zeus. *Rev.* ΑΡΓΕΙΩΝ Bull butting. Large bronze coin of good style, end of fourth century B.C. Struck in Argos, a town of the Ethetai?—E. Assmann. 'Der Phöniciische Kronos mit Mauerkrone auf Münzen von Byblos.'—Svoronos. *Νεοελληνικαὶ παραδόσεις περὶ ἀρχαίων νομισμάτων*.—*Ἀρχαία πάλαια σύμβολα καὶ ἐκμαγεία νομισμάτων*, etc. Terra-cotta pieces such as are often found in Attica, impressed with types of coins and gems. It is suggested by Svoronos that some of these may have served as substitutes for Charon's obol.—*Νομίσματα Μακεδονίας* (Σκιώνης), *Κυζίκου καὶ Κῶ*. Svoronos publishes some specimens—including a new type—of the curious early silver coins with a bunch of grapes on the *obv.* These pieces have been attributed to Cyrene, but Svoronos favours a town of the Macedonian Chalcidice, probably Scione. Some specimens were purchased by Mr. Wace in Sciathus, the island off the Thessalian Magnesia. But the clue to the true attribution of some, if not all, of these coins has recently fallen into the hands of the British Museum. It consists of a coin (allied to this series) found in Peparethus (an island east of Sciathus) and inscribed with the letters ΠΕ. We have thus the early silver coinage of *Peparethus*, though previously only bronze coins were known. The types of the Peparethian coins are mainly Dionysiac as was natural in an island founded by Staphylus and famous for its wine. I propose to publish this inscribed coin and some other pieces procured by the Museum at the same time, in the pages of the *Numismatic Chronicle*.—Also various papers on Byzantine seals. May I point out that these papers would be much more helpful if they were systematically accompanied by illustrations, at least in the case of well-preserved examples, for, unfortunately, the cataloguer of lead seals has often to add to his descriptions—*μετρίως* or *κακῶς διατηρήσους*?

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxvii. No. 1.

The Use of the Optative in the Edda, Tenney Frank. *ὡς ἔκαρτοι* in *Thucydides*, A. G. Laird. *Causal Clauses in Livy*, R. B. Steele. *Etymological Miscellany*, Francis A. Wood. Notes: *The Etymology of ΟΔΥΣΣΕΥΣ*, George Melville Bolling. *Plautus' Mostellaria*, Herbert A. Strong. Reviews, etc.: Norden's *Vergilius Maro Aeneis VI.*, Charles Knapp. Hepding's *Attis: Seine Mythen und Sein Kult*, Grant Showerman. Summaries of Periodicals. Brief Mention by the Editor (notice of Usener, Ramorino's *Persius*, Conybeare and Stock's *Selections from the LXX*, A. Macé's address on Latin Pronunciation, etc.); by C. K. (Dougan's *Disputationes Tusculanae*); by D. M. R. (Baumgarten Poland and Wagner's *Die Hellenische Kultur*). Recent Publications, etc.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1906.

2 May. O. Immisch, *Die innere Entwicklung des griechischen Epos* (K. Kunst), favourable. L. van Hook, *The metaphorical terminology of Greek rhetoric and literary criticism* (H. Blümner). W. Soltan, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in der Biographie des Valerius Poplicola* (Fr. Reuss).

9 May. Meyers Reisebücher. *Griechenland und Kleinasien*. 6. Aufl. (G. Lang). *Thucydides*, Book I, ed. by E. C. Marchant (H. Gillischewski). 'An excellent school-book, which should be translated into German.' Galen, *Über die Kräfte der Nahrungsmittel*. Book I, cc. 1-13, herausg. von G. Helmreich. G. Ferrara, *La forma della Britannia secondo la testimonianza di Tacito* (Ed. Wolff). G. Ferrara, *Della voce 'Scutula'* (Ed. Wolff).

16 May. R. Pöhlmann, *Grundriss der griechischen Geschichte*. 3. Aufl. (Schneider). A. Hauvette, *Archiloque, sa vie et ses poésies* (J. Sitzler), favourable. J. Heckmann, *Über präpositionlose Ortsbezeichnung im Altlateinischen* (H. Ziemer). G. Grupp, *Kulturgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*. I. *Untergang der heidnischen Kultur*. II. *Anfänge der christlichen Kultur* (J. Ziehen), favourable on the whole.

23 May. Xenophon, *Anabasis*. Text by W. Gemoll. 3. Aufl. (W. Nitsche). O. Binder, *Die Abfassungszeit von Senecas Briefen* (C. Hosius). H. Blase, *Studien und Kritiken zur lateinischen Syntax*, I and II. (H. Ziemer). J. Ulrich, *Proben der lateinischen Novellistik des Mittelalters* (M. Manitius).

30 May. Berliner Klassikertexte. III. *Griechische Papyri medizinischen und naturwissen-*

schaftlichen Inhalts, bearb. von W. Kalbfleisch und H. Schöne (W. Crönert). A. Wittneben, *Das Perikleische Zeitalter in Aristotles' Schrift vom Staate der Athener* (Schneider), favourable. E. Bourget, *L'administration financière du sanctuaire Pythique au IV^e siècle avant J.-C.* (H. Gillischewski). C. D. Buck, *A grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Bartholomae), favourable. Tacito, *Il libro III. delle Storie*, commentato da L. Valmagggi (E. Wolff).

6 June. A. W. Verrall, *Essays on four plays of Euripides* (W. Nestle). 'In spite of their acuteness the result of these studies is comparatively slight.' Xenophon's *Anabasis*, erkl. von Rehdantz-Carnuth-Nitsche. II. Books IV-VII. 6. Aufl. (W. Gemoll). *Appiani historia Romana*, ex rec. L. Mendelssohnii, ed. alt. correctior cur. P. Viereck. II. (W. Crönert). E. Dünzelmann, *Aliso und die Varusschlacht* (Ed. Wolff), unfavourable. Ph. Krebs, *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache*. 7. Aufl. von J. H. Schmalz (Th. Stangl).

13 June. *Festschrift zum 25 jährigen Stiftungsfest des Historisch-Philologischen Vereins der Universität München*, redigiert von Ammon, Hey, Melber (O. Weissenfels). W. Dignan, *The idle actor in Aeschylus* (Chr. Muff), favourable. *Xenophon's respublica Lacedaemoniorum*, rec. G. Pierleoni (W. Gemoll). *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica*, Edit prim. cur. Im. Bekker, alt. L. Dindorf, rec. C. Th. Fischer. IV. (Fr. Preuss). W. Soltan, *Petrus anekdoten und Petruslegenden in der Apostelgeschichte* (J. Draeseke). P. Maas, *Die Chronologie der Hymnen des Romanos* (J. Draeseke). R. D. Archer-Hind, *Translations into Greek verse and prose* (H. Draheim), very favourable.

20 June. C. Niebuhr, *Forschung und Darstellung. Vermerke und Einzelheiten zur historischen Betrachtungsweise insbesondere der alten Orient* (O. Meusel). H. Winckler, *Der alte Orient und die Bibel* (O. Meusel). *Paulys Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, herausg. von G. Wissowa. 10. Halbb. *Donatio-Ephoroi* (Fr. Harder). W. S. Ferguson, *Athenian politics in the early third century B.C.* Nachwort von E. Meyer (Schneider). *Horaz sämtliche Gedichte im Sinne* J. G. Herders erkl. von K. Staedler (W. Nitsche) I. 27 June. Th. Zielinski, *Die Antike und wir*. Übersetzung von E. Schoeler (O. Weissenfels). W. S. Ferguson, *The oligarchic revolution at Athens of the year 103/2 B.C.* (Schneider), favourable. *Horaz sämtliche Gedichte im Sinne* J. G. Herders erkl. von K. Staedler (W. Nitsche) II. favourable. P. Oltramare, *L'épître d'Horace à Auguste, son objet et sa disposition* (O. Weissenfels).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches. 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly).

* * Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

- Adam (Dr. J.), see *Praelections* etc.
- Aristotle. Ross (G. R. T.) *Aristotle De Sensu and De Memoria*, text and translation with introduction and commentary by G. R. T. R., D. Phil. (Edin.) 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 304. Cambridge, University Press. 1906. Cloth 9s. net.
- Brochet (J.) *Saint Jérôme et ses ennemis. Étude sur la querelle de Saint Jérôme avec Rufin d'Aquilée et sur l'ensemble de son œuvre polémique.* 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi + 496. Paris. A. Fontemoing. 1906.
- Broughton (Reginald) *Carmen Coleridgianum quod senex nauta inscribitur Latine reddidit* R. B. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 20. Oxford, Parker & Sons. 1906. Paper 1s. net.
- Brunn (Heinrich) *Kleine Schriften gesammelt von Heinrich Bulle und Hermann Brunn.* Band III. 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 356, mit 53 Abb. im Text. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1906. Geh. M. 14.
- Brunn (Hermann), see Brunn (Heinrich).
- Bruno (Bianca) *La Terza Guerra Sannitica. (Studi di Storia Antica pubblicati da Giulio Beloch. Fasc. VI.)* 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. iv + 124. Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co. 1906. L. 5.50.
- Bulle (Heinrich), see Brunn (Heinrich).
- Burnet (Joannes), see *Pluto*.
- Caesar. *Selections from Plutarch's Life of Caesar, see Plutarch.*
- Cardinali (Giuseppe) *Il regno di Pergamo, ricerche di storia e di diritto pubblico. (Studi di Storia Antica pubblicati da Giulio Beloch. Fasc. V.)* 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xvi + 304. Roma, Ermanno Loescher & Co. 1906. L. 12.
- Conway (R. S.), see *Melandra Castle*.
- Coriolanus, see *Plutarch*.
- Cornutus, see *Reppe* (R.).
- Dobson (J. F.), see *Tibullus*.
- Du Pontet (R. L. A.), see *Plutarch's Life of Caesar*.
- Euripides, see *Schroeder* (Otto).
- Gruppe (Dr. O.) *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte. Zweite Hälfte, 3. Lieferung. (Schluss des Werkes.) (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft herausg. von Dr. Iwan von Müller. Band V. Abt. 2. Hälfte 2. Lief. 3.)* 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 1153-1924. München, Oskar Beck. 1906. Geh. M. 15.
- Headlam (Dr. Walter), see *Praelections* etc.
- Hicks (E. L.), see *Melandra Castle*.
- Jackson (Dr. H.), see *Praelections* etc.
- Kayser (Johannes) *De Veterum arte poetica quaestiones selectae. (Leipzig Degree Dissertation.)* 9" x 6". Pp. 100. Lipsiae, Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis. 1906. M. 3.
- Kock (Axel), see *Lund*.
- Kornemann (E.) *Kaiser Hadrian und der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom. Eine quellenkritische Vorarbeit von E. K.* 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ ". Pp. vii + 136. Leipzig, Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1905. M. 4.20.
- Longinus. Prickard (A. O.) *Libellus de Sublimitate Dionysio Longino fere adscriptus, accedunt excerpta quaedam e Cassii Longini operibus, recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruit A. O. P. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.)* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xvi + 98 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1906. Paper 2s., cloth 2s. 6d.
- Lund. Från Filologiska Föreningen i Lund. *Språkliga Uppsatser III. (Tillegnade Axel Kock.)* 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". P. iv + 316. Lund. H. J. Möller. Leipzig, O. Harassowitz. 1906. 5 kr. (M. 5.50.)
- Lygdami Carmina, accedit Panegyricus in Messallam, edidit adnotationibus exegeticis et criticis instruit Geyza Némethy. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 180. Budapestini, sumptibus Academiae Litterarum Hungariae. 1906. Pretium 3 cor.
- Melandra Castle, being the Report of the Manchester and District Branch of the Classical Association for 1905, edited by R. S. Conway, Professor of Latin, with an Introduction by the Rev. E. L. Hicks. With numerous plans and illustrations. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. xvi + 167. Manchester, at the University Press. 1906. 5s. net.
- Mayhoff (C.), see *Pliny*.
- Némethy (G.), see *Lygdami Carmina*.
- Nepos (Cornelius). *Lives of Miltiades, Lysander, Themistocles, Alcibiades, Iphicrates*, edited with introduction and vocabulary by L. D. Wainwright. (*Arnold's Latin Texts.*) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. 64. London, Edward Arnold. 1906. 8d.
- Nicole (Jules) *Un catalogue d'œuvres d'art conservées à Rome à l'époque impériale. Texte du papyrus latin VII de Genève transcrit et commenté par J. N. avec un facsimilé.* 10" x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 34. Genève-Bâle, Librairie Georg et Cie. 1906.
- Ovid. *Selections*, edited, with introduction and vocabulary by George Yeld, M.A. (*Arnold's Latin Texts.*) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. 64. London, Edward Arnold. 1906. 8d.
- Ovid in Exile, edited with introduction and vocabulary by L. D. Wainwright, M.A. (*Arnold's Latin Texts.*) 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. 64. London, Edward Arnold. 1906. 8d.
- Paepcke (Charles) *De Pergamenorum Litteratura.* 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 38. Rostochii, Typis Academicis Adlerianis. 1906. M. 1.50.
- Plato. Burnet (Joannes) *Platonis opera recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruit J. B. Tomus I. fasc. i. Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito, Phaedo. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.)* 7 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 172 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1906. Paper 2s.
- Pliny. Mayhoff (C.) *C. Plini Secundi naturalis historiae libri XXXVII post Ludovici Jani obitum recognovit et scripturae discrepantia adjecta edidit C. M. Vol. I. Libri i-vi. (Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.)* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xviii + 556. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1906. Geh. M. 8.

- Plutarch's Life of Caesar.* Selections from, edited by R. L. A. Du Pontet. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. iv + 108. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1906. Cloth 2s.
- Plutarch's Life of Coriolanus,* edited with introduction and notes. $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$. Pp. iv + 70. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1906. Cloth 2s. (50 c.).
- Praelections delivered before the Senate of the University of Cambridge,* 25th, 26th, 27th January, 1906. (Dr. Jackson, Plato, Cratylus, cc. 42-44; Dr. Adam, Pindar, Fragment, 131; Dr. Verrall, Aeschylus, Eumenides, 734-743; Dr. Walter Headlam, Aeschylus, Agamemnon, second chorus; Prof. Ridgeway, Aeschylus, Supplices, 304 sqq.) $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 164. Cambridge, University Press. 1906. 5s. net.
- Prickard (A. O.), see *Longinus*.
- Reppe (Rudolf) De L. Annae Cornuto. (*Leipzig degree Dissertation*.) $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. 90. Lipsiae, Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis. 1906. M. 1.80.
- Ridgeway (Prof. William), see *Praelections* etc.
- Ross (G. R. T.), see *Aristotle*.
- Schmiedel (Paul Wilhelm), see *Smith (William Benjamin)*.
- Schroeder (Otto) De Tichoscopia Euripidis Phoenissis inserta (Eur. Phoen. 103-192). (Commentatio ex programme Gymnasii Regii Joachimici Berolinensis seorsum expressa.) $10'' \times 8''$. Pp. 16. Leipzig, Gustav Fock. 1906. M. 1.
- Smith (William Benjamin) Der vorchristliche Jesus nebst weiteren Vorstudien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums, mit einem Vorworte von Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel. $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. xviii + 244. Gieszen, Alfred Töpelmann (vormals J. Ricker). 1906. Geh. M. 4., geb. M. 5.
- Symonds (Aubrey V.), see *Tacitus*.
- Tacitus.* The Annals of Tacitus. Books I.-VI. translated by Aubrey V. Symonds. $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. xiv + 296. London, Swan Sonnenschein and Co. 1906. Cloth 3s. 6d. net, leather 4s. 6d. net.
- Tibullus.* Dobson (J. F.) Selections from Tibullus edited with introduction and vocabulary by J. F. D. (*Arnold's Latin Texts*.) $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4''$. Pp. 64. London, Edward Arnold. 1906. 8d.
- Verhandlungen der 48. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Hamburg* von 3. bis 6. Oktober, 1905. $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6''$. Pp. viii + 224. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1906. Geh. M. 6.
- Verrall (Dr. A. W.), see *Praelections* etc.
- Wainwright (L. D.), see *Nepos (Cornelius)* and *Ovid*.
- Werner (Paul) De Incendiis urbis Romae aetate Imperatorum. (*Leipzig degree Dissertation*.) $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. 88. Lipsiae, Typis Roberti Noske Bornensis. 1906. M. 1.60.
- Wilton (W. F.) Dies Romani. Short Readings from Latin Literature, compiled by W. F. W. $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. viii + 120. London, Edward Arnold. 1906. Cloth 1s. 6d.
- Yeld (George), see *Ovid*.